UC-NRLF
$B 295 815

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/modernimmersionn00thorrich

MODERN IMMERSION

NOT

SCRIPTURE BAPTISM.

BY WILLIAM THORN,

AUTHOR OF 'LECTURES ON THE CHRISTIAN SABBATH,' &c.

LONDON:

PUBLISHED BY HOLDSWORTH AND BALL,

18, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD.

1831.

BX811
T5

27f69

WINCHESTER:
ROBBINS AND WHEELER, PRINTERS.

TO

THE REV. JOHN GRIFFIN,

PASTOR OF THE INDEPENDENT CHURCH AND CONGREGATION, PORTSEA, AND SENIOR MEMBER OF THE

'HAMPSHIRE ASSOCIATION;'

AND TO ALL

THE OTHER MINISTERS AND GENTLEMEN

COMPOSING THAT RESPECTABLE BODY;

THE FOLLOWING TREATISE,

ENTITLED

'MODERN IMMERSION NOT SCRIPTURE BAPTISM,'

IS INSCRIBED

BY THEIR VERY OBEDIENT

HUMBLE SERVANT,

WILLIAM THORN.

ANALYSIS OF THE WORK.

PRELIMINARY OBSERVATIONS.

I. *Respecting religious controversies in general.*

II. *Respecting the Baptist controversy in particular.*

THE QUESTION AT ISSUE STATED.

PART FIRST.—*A statement, examination, and refutation, of the arguments employed in support of the* EXCLUSIVE *system of immersion-baptism.* Page

A summary of the Baptists' arguments - - 42

A few preparatory and explanatory remarks - *ib.*

SECT. I.—*The natural conclusions of common readers.*

The remarks of the Baptists on this head - 47

1. But most common readers decide against them - 48
2. Their judgment depends on the words of the learned 49
3. If their decisions are valid, learning is useless - 51
4. The doctrines of scripture plainer than ceremonies 53
5. Our positions accord with divine benevolence - 54
6. Human testimonies condemned and referred to - 55
7. Reference to the Old Test. necessary and proper 56
8. Gospel precepts harmonize with our views - 57

SECT. II.—*The concessions of numerous Pedobaptists.*

The reasonings of the Baptists on this point - 58

1. Several postulates on arguments *ad hominem* - 59
2. The quotations themselves subject to correction 60
3. The B. regard these writers as strangely inconsistent 61
4. They renounce the principle of such evidence - 63

Page

5. The concessions in accordance with sprinkling - 64
6. Pedobaptist writers not honestly treated - - 65
7. Such a mode of reasoning very objectionable - 67
8. The Baptists make them concede too much - 68
9. Open communionists concede the validity of spr. 69
10. Close communionists strangely inconsistent - 70
11. Wherein our citations differ from theirs - - 72

SECT. III.—*The history of the Christian Church.*

The arguments of the Baptists on this subject - 74
1. They do not know how baptism was administered *ib.*
2. —— do not follow the ancient modes - - 75
3. —— disclaim all historical evidence - - 77
4. Antiquity favours pouring as well as dipping - 80
5. Baptismal regeneration, &c. old as dipping - 82
6. The concessions of Pedobaptists accounted for 83
7. Instances of aspersion baptism in early times - 84
8. Why dipping was first introduced - - - 86
9. The Greek church opposed to the Baptists - 89
10. The Church of England no rule for their guidance 93

SECT. IV.—*The meaning of the Greek word* BAPTIZO.

The sentiments of the Baptists on its import - 95
They make this the hinge of the debate - - 97
1. The primary sense of words examined - - 98
2. *Baptizo* might not be used in its primary sense 99
3. Dipping not the primary meaning of it - - 100
4. *Bapto* never used for Christian baptism - - 102
5. Lexicographers on the word baptize - - 103
6. Baptists translation of it in Greek writers - 104
7. Different applications of the word - - - 106
8. More extended translations of it - - - 107
9. Other passages in Greek authors - - - 108

Page

10. Deductions, and Mr. Booth's assumptions - 109
11. The sense of it in the Sept. and Apocrypha - 111
12. The texts where it occurs examined - - 113
13. Inferences from these expositions - - - 119
14. *Baptizo* synonymous with *tabal* and *tingo* - 120
15. The sense of the term in the New Testament - 122
16. The verb translated by the word to plunge - 126
17. Objections respecting *cheo* and *rhantizo* answered 128
18. The Cyro-Chaldaic translation of baptize - 129
19. Vague terms employed for dipping - - 130
20. These terms examined and proved defective - 132
21. This topic further illustrated - - - 134
22. The folly of such phraseology exposed - - 136
23. Conclusions from the above enquiry - - 137

SECT. V.—*The import of four Greek prepositions.*

The prepositions, and arguments founded on them 139
1. The Baptists make them express too much - *ib.*
2. Total submersion not proved by them - - 140
3. Nor immersion in any degree - - - 142
4. Schleusner's definitions of them - - - 143
5. Their various translations in the English Bible 144
6. Several passages rendered on B. principles - 145
7. The versatile character of them established - 146
8. Conclusions, with Cox and Robinson's remarks - 149

SECT. VI.—*The circumstances of the first N. T. baptisms.*

Baptists' inference from bapt. in Jordan and Enon 150
1. This a departure from positive precepts, &c. - 151
2. John's baptism not a Christian rite - - *ib.*
3. No proof of his dipping into Jordan - - 153
4. No proof of immersion in Enon - - - 154
5. Great waters very unsuitable for dipping - - 160

Page

SECT. VII.—*Certain allusions to scripture baptism.*

1. Of the Hebrews in the Red Sea - - - 163
2. Of Noah and his family in the ark - - 164
3. The sufferings of Christ and his disciples - - 165
4. The virtual sufferings of believers in Christ - 168

SECT. VIII.—*The immutable nature of scripture precedents.*

Declaration of the Baptists on this head - - 183
1. They know not the original mode of baptism - 184
2. Their assertions on a definitive mode considered 186
God the only judge how plain to render it - 187
Has granted a latitude in other institutions - 188
The Lord's Supper not minutely modified - 189
The conjectures of the Baptists considered - *ib.*
3. They omit many positive institutions - - 190
4. They do many things not commanded - - 193
5. Their vindication of these things examined - 195
6. Deductions from the preceding remarks - - 198

PART SECOND.—*A variety of circumstantial evidence, proving that pouring or sprinkling is the* ONLY *proper mode of scripture baptism.*

A particular view of the question in debate - 199
Circumstantial evidence alone available - - 200
Summary of the subsequent arguments - - 202

SECT. I.—*The contradictions and difficulties of the Baptists.*

Reasons for adducing them in this place - - 203
1. Contradictions respecting the word baptize - 204
Affirm it means only and always to dip - - *ib.*
Admit it signifies other modes of action - - 205
2. Their various unsupported contrivances - - 207
For John's dipping his converts with decency - *ib.*
For baptizing the 3,000 on the day of Pentecost 208

Page

And for the Jailor and family at midnight - 209
3. Their polemical tact and manœuvrings - - 210
Resting on human authority and condemning it - *ib.*
Contend against inference and yet infer - - 211
Prove too much, and therefore nothing - - 213
Views of the figurative use of the verb baptize - 214
When the element descends, they talk of quantity 215
Specimens of inconclusive arguments - - *ib.*
Lay great stress on the solemnity of dipping - 217
Differ among themselves as to the design of bapt. 218
Their arguments on the arrangement of words refut. 220
Their literal interpretation of scripture examined 221
The administrator, subject, &c. of bapt. not defin. 223
Their mode of reasoning very incongruous - 225

SECT. II.—*The frequent application of the word baptize.*
Circumstances, not terms, must settle the dispute 226
Often, however, used for pouring as the action - 227
1. By Greek writers in general - - - - *ib.*
2. In the Septuagint and Apocrypha - - - 231
3. In the New Testament - - - - 236
4. Objections stated and answered - - 241
Bapto and *rhantizo* used for different actions - *ib.*
There is no certainty in language - - - *ib.*
Pouring or sprinkling not proveable - - 242

SECT. III.—*The mode of baptism among the Jews.*
Ceremonies, called baptism, common among them 243
1. Robinson's classification of Jewish washings - 245
2. Sprinkling synonymous with cleansing, &c. - *ib.*
3. Sprinkling a part, a total purification - - 246
4. Most purifications for partial defilement - 248
5. Purifications instit. where dipping was impossible 249

Page

6. Various texts cited by Robinson for dipping - 250
7. Jewish purifications, personal and ministerial - 251
   Personal purifications not baptism - - 252
   Ministerial purifications always by sprinkling - 253
8. Moses' washing Aaron, &c. no exception - 254
9. Gospel baptism analogous to legal anointing - 256
10. Solomon's brazen sea not to bathe in - - 257
11. Heathen sprinkling the same as Jewish baptism - 258
12. Spoils of war cleansed by sprinkling - - 260
13. Personal baptisms in the days of Christ - - 262
14. This further illustrated from John ii. 6. - - 264
15. And also from Mark vii. 1-9. - - - 265
16. Josephus on the washing of the Essens - - 266
17. Objection to this reasoning answered - - 268
18. Deductions from the preceding remarks - - 270

Sect. IV.—*Several instances of scripture baptism.*

1. Baptism administered on conviction - - 272
2. The people were not prepared for dipping - 274
3. Difficulties in case they had second suits - - *ib.*
4. If they had not, the difficulties increased - 275
5. Different expressions on river and city baptisms - 276
6. No instance of refusing to baptize - - - 277
7. The Ethiopian Eunuch only affused - - 279
   The Greek terms indefinite here - - - *ib.*
   The place unfavourable for dipping - - 280
   The water without a name - - - - 281
   Going into the water not baptizing - - *ib.*
   No proof that they went into the water at all - 282
   Must have gone to the water for affusion - - *ib.*
   A dipping would have been very indelicate - 283
8. The blessed Redeemer not immersed - - 284

Page

The terms will not prove immersion - - 284
Nor his coming up out of the water - - 285
There is evidence that he was affused, &c. &c. - *ib.*
9. Cornelius and his family only affused - - 288
10. The Samaritans, Paul, and the Jailor - - 290
11. Deductions from the preceding narratives - - 293

SECT. V.—*The numbers baptized by John and the apostles.*

1. The baptism of the multitudes by John - - 294
John alone baptized his converts - - - 295
Baptized the population in six months - - 296
May be supposed to have dipped 2,000,000 - *ib.*
This is impracticable - - - - - 298
Could not have dipped a tenth of them - - 299
All could have been affused with ease - - 300
Baptized according to some known scheme - 301
No new specification of baptism given him - *ib.*
John's baptism being from heaven no objection - 302
The present practice of John's disciples - - 303
2. Of the 3,000 at Jerusalem - - - - 304
The time very limited, five or six hours - - 305
The twelve disciples could not have done it - *ib.*
If more engaged, more places of baptisms - 306
There must have been examining them - - 307
There are difficulties as to dress, &c. &c. - - 308
3. Numerous baptisms subsequently administered - 317
4. Mr. Booth's solution of the difficulty considered 319

SECT. VI.—*The baptism of the Holy Ghost.*

1. The baptism of the Spirit and of water conjoined 321
2. The promises of the Old Testament examined - 323
3. The representations of the Old Testament - 324
4. The mode of his coming in the New Testament 325

Page

5. The baptism of the Spirit, by pouring, conceded 326
6. Jewish and spiritual consecration analogous - 327
7. The baptism of the Spirit an anointing - - *ib.*
8. The objection, founded on Acts ii. 2, answered 328

Sect. VIII.—*The numerous difficulties attending immers.*

1. Positive laws yield to moral obligations - - 332
2. The dread of most to be plunged under water - 334
3. The case of aged and sickly converts - - 337
4. Dipping liable to great indelicacy - - - 338
4.* Destroys all devotion in the baptized - - 346
5. Difficulties affecting the minister - - - 348
6. Obstacles arising from climate and manners - 350
7. Seldom know when baptism is entire - - 351
8. An objection to this reasoning answered - - 354

Sect. VIII.—*Danger of dipping in many cases.*

Several cures said to have arisen from dipping - 357
1. But they are incidental and fortuitous - - 359
2. Bathing recommended by physicians considered 360
3. Accidents do not arise from want of skill or faith 362
4. Should not sacrifice truth through fear of conseq. 364
5. Cases of accidents kept very secret - - - 365
6. Dangers of dipping illustrated - - - 366
Dangers are often apprehended - - - *ib.*
Dangers of temporary influence - - - 369
Dangers fatal in their consequence - - - 371
7. Several inferences and observations - - - 373

CONCLUSION.

1. Remarks on the mode of the investigation - 376
2. Recapitulation of the evidence employed - - 378
3. Deductions from the whole enquiry - - 380

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

ADVERTISEMENT.

IN submitting the following Discussion to the religious public—(the substance of which the author delivered to his congregation May 11, 1828)—it may be proper to make the subsequent prefatory remarks, in addition to those which will be found in the introductory observations.

I. It appears to the author, after all that has been published on the 'mode of baptism,' that a treatise like the present was desirable and requisite. On this conviction, as well as in compliance with the advice of several pious and intelligent friends, who either heard the sermons from the pulpit, or have since perused the enlarged manuscript copy, he now sends the work into the world. Nor can the Antipedobaptists, who have so recently mooted the controversy, by the publication or re-printing of books on this topic, complain of the appearance of his volume at the present time.

II. What he has written on this subject is done to the best of his ability. The controversy has long and devoutly engaged his attention—almost every work of importance, on both sides of the question, has been carefully read, and some of them repeatedly—the arguments in them have been maturely weighed—and what was deemed material

to the debate, has been embodied in the ensuing dissertation.—He begs, however, to observe, that though he has made considerable use of the writings of his Pedobaptist brethren, he shall not deem himself involved in the smallest measure by any thing they may have advanced contrary to his own opinions.

III. In the composition of this treatise, he has aimed more especially at three things :—Brevity, without which a work of this nature will seldom be read by the busy—Perspicuity, without which it could not be understood by the multitude—Conviction, without which all his labour would be lost. Large, abstruse, or expensive publications, can do little general good or harm to any opinion. It may be proper to observe, also, that, from an unvarying effort at condensation of matter, amusing episodes and flowers of rhetoric are necessarily excluded. This omission, however, to the patient and studious enquirer after truth, will be rather a commendation of the volume than otherwise.

IV. The circumstances which first induced the author to investigate the mode of baptism so extensively were the following :—A few years ago, he resided in another part of the country. In his neighbourhood lived a very respectable and excellent Baptist minister; and, at a village destitute of dissenting worship, not far from his residence, a home-missionary, of the Independent denomination, commenced his labours. The good Baptist, and some of his people, became rather uneasy at having a Pedobaptist preacher so near them. A kind of outcry was raised—books and letters, dissuasive of infant sprinkling, were sent him—a paper war was threatened. The missionary, having

little time for such controversial pursuits, solicited the author to become his champion. To this he consented, and, consequently, requested the Baptist minister that, if he was resolved to debate the subject, to send him his epistles. He at first declined; but, about a week after, his servant arrived with a long letter respecting 'The Mode of Baptism,' in the form of interrogations. In answer to this, eight elaborate letters were successively returned, with a request that they might be corrected. No reply, however, was sent to any one of them. This induced a still further investigation; and hence were collected the materials which compose the ensuing treatise.

V. To aid the judgment of the reader, a list of Baptist writers, cited or alluded to in the subsequent pages, with the titles and editions of their publications, is here subjoined:—

Anderson, W. 'Intr. &c. to Taylor's B. Just.' Lond. 1818.
Birt, Isaiah, 'Defence of Scripture Baptism.' Plym. N. D.
,, ,, 'Strictures on Mr. Mend's Pamphlet.' Ib. 1797.
,, ,, 'Vindication of the Baptists.' Bristol, 1793.
Birt, J. 'A Letter to Dr. Ralph Wardlaw.' Lond. 1825.
Booth, A. 'Pedobaptism Examined,' 2 vols. Ib. 1787.
,, ,, 'Defence of Pedobaptism Examined.' Ib. 1792.
,, ,, 'An Apology for the Baptists.' Ib. 1813.
Burt, Job, 'A Treatise on Baptism.' Ib. 1732.
Butterworth, J. 'Conference Weighed.' Coventry, 1784.
,, ,, 'Vindication of Ditto.' Ib. 1785.
Cox, Dr. 'Reply to Ewing, Dwight, &c.' Lond. 1824.
Countryman, 'On the Cand. of P. Edwards.' Ib. 1795.
D'Anvers, H. 'Treatise on Baptism.' Ib. 1675.

D'Anvers, H. 'Innoc. and Truth Vind.' Lond. 1675.
,, ,, 'A Sec. Reply in Def. of the Treatise.' Ib.
,, ,, 'A Rejoinder to Wills's Vindiciæ.' Ib.
,, ,, 'A Third Reply.' 1676.
Dore, J. 'Pref. to Antip. and Fem. Com. Consis. Ib. 1795.
,, ,, 'Sermons on Baptism.' Ib. 1829.
Evans, Dr. J. &c. 'Lectures on Baptism.' Ib. 1826.
Fellows, J. 'Hymns on Believers' Bapt.' Birming. 1773.
Foot, W. 'A Prac. Disc. concern. Bapt.' Warmin. 1820.
Gale, Dr. J. 'Reflections on Wall's Hist.' Lond. 1820.
Gibbs, G. 'Baptism of Believers by Immersion.' Ib. 1829.
Gill, Dr. 'Ser. and Tracts,' 4to. v. 2. p. 196-533. 1773.
,, ,, 'Testimonies of Ancient Writers.' Ib.
,, ,, 'Infant Bapt. a Part and Pillar of Popery.' Ib.
,, ,, 'Infant Baptism an Innovation.' Ib.
,, ,, 'Baptism a Divine Commandment.' Ib.
,, ,, 'The Ancient Mode of Bapt. by Immers.' Ib.
,, ,, 'A Defence of Ditto.' Ib.
Hall, Robt. 'Essential Difference, &c.' Lond. 1823.
Jenkins, Dr. J. 'Inconsist. of Inf. Sprink.' Wrex. 1784.
,, ,, 'Calm Rep. to De Courcy's Rej.' Ib. 1778.
,, ,, 'A Defence of the Baptists.' Lond. 1795.
Keach, Benj. 'An Answer to Mr. Jas. Owen.' Ib. 1696.
Kinghorn, J. 'A Reply to Mr. P. Edwards.' Nor. 1795.
Maclean, A. 'Miscellaneous Works.' Edit. Edin. 1811.
,, ,, 'Letters addressed to J. Glass.' Ib.
,, ,, 'On Christ's Commission.' Ib.
,, ,, 'Defence of Believers' Baptism.' Ib.
,, ,, 'Strictures on Mr. Carter's Remarks.' Ib.
,, ,, 'Letter to a Correspondent.' Ib.
Newman, Dr. W. 'The Perpetuity of Bapt.' Lond. 1820.
,, ,, 'Baptismal Immersion.' Ib. 1819.

Paice, Henry, ' Infant Baptism Considered.' Lond. 1796.
Pearce, S. ' The Script. Doct. of Chris. Bap. Birm. 1794.
Rees, D. ' Inf. Bapt. no Instit. of Christ.' Lond. 1734.
Robinson, R. ' The History of Baptism.' Ib. 1790.
Ryland, Dr. J. ' Candid Statements.' Ib. 1827.
Stennett, J. ' Answer to Mr. Russen.' Ib. 1704.
„ „ Dr. S. ' Answer to Addington.' Ib. 1775.

VI. Should the inquisitive reader desire to examine the Pedobaptist side of the question more fully than the following concise dissertation will enable him, the subsequent authors, whose names shall be merely mentioned, and some of whose observations are hereafter referred to, and often without a specific acknowledgment, will afford him ample and convincing arguments.

Addington	Edwards	Miller	Tyreman
Baxter	Evans	Munro	Urwick
Boston	Ewing	Osgood	Walker
Bostwick	Fleming	Pirie	Wall
Bradbury	Hammond	Russen	Wardlaw
Brekell	Henry	Taylor	Williams
De Courcy	Isaac	Towgood	Wills

VII. The author, as far as he knows, has fairly and fully stated all the material objections and arguments of his opponents, correctly cited their publications, and, in every respect, openly and candidly opposed their system, and zealously laboured to maintain his own. Nor has he, in any instance, adopted a species of reasoning or polemical discussion, of which the Baptists have not afforded numerous and striking precedents. Hence they cannot justly complain of the manner observed in conducting this contro-

versy. Since the discourses were originally delivered from the pulpit, the work has been very considerably enlarged with such critical and other remarks as were not precisely suited to a promiscuous assembly ; though the style of a public address has been preserved throughout.

VIII. He has also been very particular in giving his authorities for all the material passages collected from his opponents, and arranged in the ensuing pages. This method he deems of considerable utility in all controversial publications ; and as a matter of course in the present enquiry. On all the more important points in dispute, the sentiments of several writers have been collated, for the purpose of showing that they are not the opinions of some isolated and unaccredited authority.

IX. He begs to request the courteous reader that he will peruse the work all through with attention and candour ; or, to use the words of Mr. Maclean, 'that he will 'not satisfy himself with carping at occasional inadvertencies, but candidly consider the scope and force of the arguments ; and especially the scriptures adduced in support of 'them.' To throw aside a book on account of a few real or fancied discrepancies, or to condemn all the arguments, because of some trifling mistake or illogical deduction, is incompatible with the candour we profess to exercise while seeking after truth in spiritual matters. Nor would it be consistent with an earnest desire to obtain correct and ample information on a religious subject of acknowledged difficulty, for a person to decline the perusal of a volume because certain parts of it may appear somewhat tedious—which, in discussions of this kind, are often unavoidable.

X. As the ultimate object of the following treatise is the maintenance of what the writer most conscientiously considers to be the truth and the revealed will of God, he presumes no pious, judicious, or candid individual will charge him with improper motives in making it public. Should any person discover any material errors in facts or arguments, of which he is not aware, and respectfully announce them to the author, they shall be frankly and publicly renounced. As for empty declamation, unsupported assertions, and mortified ridicule, they will meet with no reply from the author.

XI. The writer, however, will not dissemble his reluctance in publishing the ensuing pages; not from any misgivings as to the goodness of his cause or the force of his evidence; but from a fear of paining the minds, and forfeiting the friendship of many good people among his opponents. He regards the Baptists, on the whole, as a body of believers equalled by few, and surpassed by none, in many of the brightest excellencies of Christianity. But, as he can peruse their polemical writings, some of which are quite as highly spiced as his own, without losing a particle of his great esteem and affection for them, he would fain anticipate a like indulgence on their part. From the pious, candid, and intelligent, his expectations are sanguine; but, if even disappointed, his regard for what he considers the mind of Christ, must ever be the preponderating influence in the scale of his operations.

XII. The writer cannot close these prefatory remarks without expressing his great obligations to those ministers and friends who have favoured him with the loan of books

to facilitate his enquiries, with critical observations to aid his judgment, and with the exertion of their influence to promote the sale of this publication. He returns them his cordial thanks, and sincerely hopes, that the work, as completed, will meet their entire approbation. With much diffidence, he now commits it to the blessing of God and the candour of the Christian public.

MODERN IMMERSION

NO SCRIPTURE BAPTISM.

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

ACCORDING to our recent announcement, we purpose directing your attention to the long-agitated subject of Christian baptism: and have selected the following text as the basis of our future observations:—

MATT. iii. 11—'*I, indeed, baptize you with water unto repentance; but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire.*'

But, before we proceed to the more immediate discussion of the topic in hand, it will be requisite to make a few

PRELIMINARY OBSERVATIONS.

FIRST. RESPECTING RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSIES IN GENERAL.

1. It is proper and requisite that all who profess any distinctive or generally controverted tenets in religion, should be fully convinced that they are certainly scriptural and obligatory on them. To embrace any doctrine merely because our fathers believed it, or because it happens to be

current, or to practice any ceremonies because they are pompous or common, is beneath the character and claims of those who are commanded and profess to 'Prove all 'things, and to hold fast that which is good.'

II. The usual apathy of religious professors in the present day respecting the great doctrines and duties of the gospel, is a source of deep regret to most persons duly interested in the welfare of the church; and when placed in comparison with the enquiry and information of believers in former times, makes them mourn over the indifference of the age in which they live.

III. To ascertain 'the mind of the Spirit,' in many cases, is a matter of considerable difficulty—requiring all the research, judgment, and assistance, divine and human, which can be given or obtained. Every one, indeed, presumes that his views of religion are clear and correct, and is often surprised that any person should attempt to overturn his irrefragable positions; but he forgets that, after all, he may be mistaken, and that truth may be found on the other side of the debate.

IV. A large portion of the professing population substitute sincerity of motives for the investigation of truth—supposing that mere good intentions are as acceptable to God as correct principles. But, while sincerity is essential to vital devotion, its separation from revealed truth would be destructive of Christianity—otherwise every false religion would be as good as that of the gospel—its votaries, for aught we know, being equally sincere.

V. Multitudes make a wide and improper distinction between what they denominate essential and non-essential truth. When any scriptural doctrine or duty is pressed upon them, they coolly reply, 'Perhaps it is true, but not requi-

'site to salvation.' Some things are confessedly more important than others; but 'All scripture is given by inspi-'ration of God;' therefore, purposely to overlook or undervalue any revealed truth, however trivial in our esteem, and not to practice any sacred duty, however small it may appear to us, are unworthy of a Christian, and criminal in the sight of Christ—as it indirectly charges him with commanding what is not necessary to be done.

VI. There are many weak persons who imagine, or pretend to believe, that the sense which 'poor plain people' put on the sacred scriptures, must be the true one, because their minds are not imbued with the sophistry of the schools, nor perverted by the delusions of philosophy, and because the Bible was written for the poor, and, of course, adapted to their comprehension. That there are many passages which plain people may interpret aright, is not to be questioned; but that there are numerous texts which they cannot comprehend without the assistance of others, must surely be admitted. If the poor are not polluted by learning, they are equally depraved by nature and more blinded by ignorance. If the objection were universally true, knowledge would be an evil; at least, it would be of no advantage—the ancient schools of the prophets must have been superfluous—and the religious seminaries of the present day might be immediately abolished. But this doctrine is only adduced to favour a system which is upheld by ignorance rather than wisdom.

VII. There is also an evil, common among most persuasions, consisting in a forcible resistance of the convictions produced by opposing truth. Many tell us they will never alter their sentiments—they are immovably fixed, and will inviolably maintain their former opinions. Sometimes they

urge, not only the most frivolent arguments in support of their notions, but often such as they know to be quite irrelevant to the question. Others shut their ears against any observations which tend to impeach the correctness of their creed or the beauty of their worship—arrogantly presuming, that nothing convincing or worth their attention can be said against it. Thus errors are perpetuated by obstinacy, and men remain in the dark through wilfully shunning the light. By this method, Protestant churches retain their errors—Popery fosters its superstitions—and Paganism continues to dominate in the world.

VIII. Some go even farther than this, and pretend to be confirmed in their notions, whether right or wrong, by every thing brought against them. And, as this is done by persons professing the most opposite sentiments, some of them can either not understand what they read, or must wilfully brave the evidence they cannot impugn. There may be cases when a feeble or injudicious advocate gives vigour to an opponent's belief; but these do not often occur; and particularly in respect of the ignorant and inexperienced, who are chiefly the first to take the other side of every such question. Let us be candid, and receive the truth, and implicitly follow its guidance. To be firm and resolute only, is the character of a mule or a pugilist; but to be conscientious and stable, is the duty of every Christian.

IX. Many people remain ignorant of various doctrines and duties of scripture through a foolish, and, it may be added, a sinful aversion to what they designate religious controversy. You have only to propose to them an explanation of certain points, about which various opinions are held by the professing community, and they immediately divert the conversation, or solicit your silence, as they can-

not disturb their tranquil souls by such debated subjects. They forget, if they ever knew, that they hardly cherish a religious idea which has not been a matter of grave dispute. This conduct is based on self-conceit or mental indolence. Taking as unquestionably true their own construction of scripture, or relying on the dogmas of some first instructor, they hold their darling opinions with the firmest grasp; nor will they subject them for a moment to the ordeal of a reasonable scrutiny; while multitudes plead an aversion to controversy, lest it should cause them the trouble of reading and thinking. It is true that moderation in our enquiries is requisite, and that polemical discussions have sometimes been conducted with asperity and rancour. But the evil above referred to exists irrespective of religious restlessness and theological rage. To prefer mental quietude to a rectified judgment is unworthy of the Christian professor. Paul 'preached the gospel with much contention;' and Jude exhorts believers 'earnestly to contend 'for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints.'

x. There are others who, being unaccustomed to investigate truth for themselves, and perceiving such a diversity of opinions about religion, think it next to impossible to ascertain what is right from what is wrong; and that, consequently, it is useless for them to attempt the enquiry. 'Such mighty champions,' say they, 'have appeared in 'defence of every religious notion, and have brought such 'plausible arguments in support of it, that we are bewil-'dered with the diversity of their creeds, and must con-'clude that the truth cannot be discovered.' This reasoning is more plausible than solid. You are to examine the scriptures with attention and prayer, and, after availing yourselves of the best helps in your possession or power, are to

form that opinion which appears most consonant with the word of God. You must give account of yourselves, your doctrines, your worship, and actions, to Christ. This individual responsibility involves the duty of a personal enquiry—nor is truth so difficult of access to the diligent, candid, and devotional mind as many suppose. At any rate, you are to deliberate maturely, and form the best judgment your minds and means will enable you. The spirit of the objection tends to confound truth and error, sin, and holiness—applies to the most lucid, as well as the most abstruse, dictates of inspiration—and would leave the people of God in never-ending and irremediable perplexity. The Christian's duty is, with an unprejudiced mind, to investigate the holy oracles, and works illustrative of them—and, after having sought the truth to the utmost of his ability, he may expect either light or mercy—to look for it on any other terms, would be folly and presumption.

SECONDLY. RESPECTING THE BAPTISMAL CONTROVERSY IN PARTICULAR.

1. The question at issue between us and our highly-respected Baptist brethren embrace two things:—first, the proper subjects, and, secondly, the proper mode of baptism. Not that these are necessarily or always connected, since our opponents tell us that the Antipedobaptists of Holland, France, &c. administer this rite by pouring or sprinkling, and the Pedobaptists, of the established Greek church, by immersion.[1] But, in this country, it is generally found, that those who reject infant baptism, adopt the practice of dipping. — not necessarily

11. This two-fold subject of Christian baptism, having

[1] Robinson, p. 504, 547; Booth, v. II. p. 479.

long engaged the attention and talents of many great and good men of different denominations, and having, as in most other cases, become more extensive and perplexing, by repeated discussion, our presuming to adduce every argument in maintenance of our system, or to meet every objection of our antagonists, would be unjustifiable. To present you with the principal reasons on which our practice is founded, and to refute the material evidence of our opponents, are all we can propose, especially within the contracted limits of these discourses.

III. We have no controversy with our opponents respecting the perpetuity of this ceremony in the Christian church—nor about the element to be employed—nor the form of words to be repeated—nor the personal benefit to be derived from the operation. We mutually reject, as superstitious and sinful, the doctrine of baptismal regeneration—the use of sponsers—and the sign of the cross. The qualifications of the candidate, and the mode of applying the water, being the only grounds of difference between us.

IV. As it would be impossible, at present, to do any thing like justice to the whole matters of debate between us, we must confine our enquiries to one branch of it—and shall select the Mode of Christian baptism as the exclusive topic of discussion. And though some may imagine this an immaterial section of the controversy, the following observations will prove it to be of very considerable, if not of paramount, importance.

1. It has been clearly proved, by a very competent judge, that where the mode of baptism has been dipping, though the subjects have been children, there have never been any sects of Antipedobaptists, or societies of people

practising the baptism of adults exclusively.[1] We presume, therefore, that if we could be brought to accord in the nature of the mode, we should not long debate respecting the age or character of the subjects.

2. It is the only question of personal concern to any who are capable of reasoning on the subject. Those who are grown to years of maturity without having been baptized, in fact or in opinion, can experience no more difficulty as to their fitness for the reception of this ordinance among the Pedobaptists than among their opponents—seeing both parties require the like qualifications of adults approaching this sacrament.

3. Ignorant persons are far more impressed, and much oftener converted to the Baptist denomination by the expressions 'going down into the water, and coming up out 'of the water,' than with any passages descriptive of the moral fitness of adults for the reception of this rite; and this is more dwelt upon by our opponents in their public addresses, than the spiritual qualifications of a grown-up candidate. 'Persons,' says Dr. Wall, 'that have any 'scruples about their baptism, do not near so much ques-'tion the validity of their baptism, for that it was received in 'infancy, as they do for that they were not dipped into the 'water.'[2] Indeed, our opponents admit, that 'it is pretty 'generally known, that they are as tenacious of the one as 'of the other, and that he must be strangely ignorant of 'their principles who asserts the contrary.'[3]

4. Our Baptist brethren indeed tell us, 'That it is for 'the possession of faith they contend, and for the evidence

[1] Wall, v. iii. p. 130. [2] Ibid, p. 129; Dore's Pref. p. 19.
[3] Countryman, p. 31.

'of that possession;'[1] that where the thing signified is not, 'the sign is a nullity;'[2] that none can be proper subjects of 'baptism, till they are in a state of salvation;'[3] that it is 'appointed expressly and exclusively for those, who have 'been regenerated and brought into the covenant of grace 'by the previous operation of the Holy Spirit upon their 'hearts. We know,' say they, 'of no discipleship to 'Christ, upon New Testament principles, that is not 'founded in a real conversion to God. Baptism is founded 'upon a work of grace on the heart, without which the 'ordinance is of no value whatever.'[4] But plain facts are point blank against them. For if any person, without genuine piety, or professing the creed of a Socinian, had been baptized by submersion—such a person, on being really converted to God, and fully embracing the sentiments held by the Baptist denomination, is not dipped afresh, either to preserve his membership in their churches, or to enter their communion. Though our opponents are as fully convinced of his having been orginally immersed in an unregenerate state, and of his subsequent conversion to God, as of their own existence, they do not reiterate this sacrament upon him. Consequently, with them, the possession of true piety and correct sentiments is not necessary to render dipping valid; nor is the sign without virtue, or esteemed a nullity, though the thing signified were unquestionably wanting; and people may be disciples of Christ, and be regarded as proper subjects of baptism among our brethren, when they are not in a state of salvation, nor brought into the covenant of grace, nor really converted to God. But, had the holiest man in the

[1] Cox, p. 113. [2] Keach, p. 34. [3] J. Stennet, p. 48.
[4] Gibbs, p. 32, 139.

nation been baptized by pouring or sprinkling, he must, ill or well, old or young, submit to an entire dipping, before he would be deemed baptized by our opponents, or admitted into their society. Hence, it is not the character of the person, but the method of the administration, which renders baptism valid among them. In fact, if dipping a person under water, in the adorable names of the sacred Trinity, be Christian baptism, and if there be only one baptism, both of which our brethren strenuously maintain,[1] then infants, (who are surely as fit subjects for baptism as unconverted adults or Socinians,) thus dipped, are really and avowedly baptized; and must not be dipped again, unless the administrator is willing to submit to the renounced, and, by him, detested, appellation of Anabaptist, or re-baptizer.[2] Nor is our argument met or mitigated, by saying the Baptists merely require a *profession* of faith to render this ordinance valid. For, first, this is not the fact —they mostly look for something more—and, secondly, it appears that the profession of a Pelagian, Antinomian, Arian, or Socinian, is deemed sufficient to give validity to a baptism which, in time, becomes introductory to communion with a church of Calvinistic Trinitarians.

5. If the matters at issue between us and our esteemed brethren present any difficulties to the generality of readers, they are, as hinted above, chiefly respecting the mode; and if Pedobaptists have slighted either branch of the controversy, it is this—consequently, should the mode be settled to your satisfaction, the dispute, as far as you are concerned, would be soon and easily brought to a close. We beg, also, to observe, that should we be again called upon to address

[1] Dore's Pref. p. 19; Jenkin's C. R. p. 12, note *e*.

[2] Booth, vol. ii. p. 97; and Apology, p. 362.

you in defence of our principles on baptism, the qualifications of the candidates shall be the topic of discussion.

v. To some the entire subject may appear too trivial to command the consideration you are requested to give even a portion of it. But, let it be observed,

1. That this, having become a party question, frequently agitated by our differing brethren, the neglect for which many plead, would expose what we deem to be the truth and the existence of our denomination to imminent danger.

2. That the due administration of a sacrament instituted by Christ to be of perpetual and universal obligation in his kingdom, and to be done in the names of the sacred Trinity, can never be a topic unworthy of our most serious attention. The pains taken by Paul to ensure a proper observance of the Lord's Supper in the church at Corinth, (1 Cor. xi. 20-34,) lead us to infer, that this sister institution, as far as prescribed, should be scrupulously regarded; and,

3. That it is calculated to relieve the minds of many good people from a considerable oppression. Immersion is frequently pronounced a heavy cross by our opponents—it is felt to be such by many that submit to it—while some, who fancy it obligatory on them, cannot, through delicacy or dread of consequences, comply with the dictates of their own opinion. The result is, that many imagine themselves living in the neglect of a religious duty, and are often perplexed in their minds about it. Now, if in the course of this investigation we can prove, that this dipping is not a duty—is not Christian baptism—we shall thereby remove a burden from the spirits of such pious, though mistaken, people—an object worthy, at least, of a strenuous attempt.

vi. From a long and diligent investigation of this contro-

versy, induced, at first, by the opposition of certain Baptists to a home missionary in another part of the country, the preacher fancies himself fully acquainted with the merits of the case, and perfectly informed of what his opponents have said, or, indeed can say, in support of their practice. So much research has been made by their advocates and apologists; so much learning and ingenuity have been brought to operate on their side of the question, and that by some of the best and greatest divines in their denominations, that they must now despair of adding any thing new and relevant in maintenance of their system. The biographer of the Rev. Abraham Booth observes, and not without reason, 'that his performance [published about 'forty years since] may almost, without an hyperbole, be 'said to have exhausted this controversy on the Baptist side 'of the question; and the simple enquirer after truth, who 'is not convinced by Mr. Booth's volumes, can hardly be 'expected to yield his judgment to any thing that man 'can say upon this long-contested point.'[1] That our opponents have said many things which appear plausible, and some that wear the semblance of solid argument, cannot be denied. But as truth can never contradict itself, and, as by pronouncing ourselves to be right, we necessarily suppose them to be wrong, we are obliged to conclude, that they have not a single valid reason in defence of their practice.

VII. You are aware that this is the first time since our union as pastor and people that your attention has been thus formally directed to the subject of baptism. And, had it not been repeatedly, though conscientiously, descanted upon in another place—had not several poor members of this and

[1] Booth's Mis. Works. v. i. p. 46.

other Pedobaptist churches in the neighbourhood, been recently immersed—and had not some of our uneducated hearers been a little perplexed by the solemn and reiterated assertions on the other side of the question, we most assuredly should have permitted the controversy to have slept in peace. But as it is, the duty we owe to this church and congregation, and to what we deem the will of our divine Master, and the respect due to the wishes of several intelligent hearers, forbid our longer silence. We shall, however, conduct this debate with as much tenderness and delicacy towards our opposing brethren, as the nature of the subject will fairly allow—disclaiming every thing like personal hostility to any individual, especially to our Baptist friends in this city, for whom we feel and shall ever cherish a cordial affection.

VIII. There are several grounds pointed out by our opponents as foundations of their mode of baptism, which may be briefly noticed here, though the principal of them will be more carefully examined in the sequel. Those which are merely colloquial, and of no material weight in the scale of the argument, will be simply mentioned and probably recur no more.

1. Our opponents sometimes urge their point on the presumption, that almost every person is of their opinion, but that the majority of them are afraid or ashamed publicly and actually to avow it. 'The Pedobaptist churches,' says Dr. Cox, 'contain vast numbers of theoretic Baptists, who 'have discernment enough to appreciate the force of evi-'dence, but not piety enough to pursue the path of duty.'[1] Now, without the production of proof, the declaration is far from ingenuous. Besides, if such were the fact, does it not

[1] Reply, p. 6.

follow that, if immersion be requisite, the delicate and merciful Son of God has, without any ostensible reason, instituted a sacrament in his church for the modest female and the sickly convert, among others, which shocks her feelings and impairs his health. This, few unprejudiced people will believe. As a counterpoise, however, to the doctor's assumption, he should have recollected that multitudes of people, denominated Baptists, object to immersion, and practice aspersion, or pouring. This is the case with the Baptists in Holland,[1] in France,[2] and in parts of America, &c.[3] He would do well, also, to enquire whether the Baptist congregations do not contain vast numbers of real Pedobaptists, who, notwithstanding all they hear about dipping in obedience to a divine command, are still for affusing infants. On what principle has the Rev. Dr. open communion, but to embrace Independents, who have either not discernment enough to appreciate the force of his evidence in favour of plunging, or not piety enough to pursue, what he terms, the path of duty?

2. Though a little remarkable, it is as frequently urged on the other hand, that they are certainly right, because their denomination is comparatively small, and because the multitude is mostly in error. But this is no more an argument for a Baptist than it is for a Socinian, Swedenborgian, or the disciples of Joanna Southcott—each of whom might plead the like argument in support of his views with equal justice and success.[4]

3. Our opponents tell us, that desiring to live quiet and peaceable lives, they are mostly respondents in this controversy,[5] and seem to infer something favourable to their

[1] Rob. p. 504, 547. [2] Adams's Rel. World Disp. v. ii. p. 63. [3] Ib. p. 53.
[4] Booth, vol. iii. p. 202-204. [5] Butt. Conf. p. 3; Ryl. p. 7; Gill, p. 317.

cause from this circumstance. They would have us believe that all their researches among ancient and heathen authors arise from the philological nature of the works published against them. This, however, if true, by no means bespeaks the purity of their system. The Church of Rome was violently attacked at the reformation; but their defensive position said nothing in their favour. Besides, the assertion is not correct. One instance, among many, will show that the Baptists can attack their differing brethren. Dr. Gale's learned and elaborate reply, as he calls it, to Dr. Wall, on the mode of baptism, was entirely uncalled for—as the vicar of Shoreham believed in dipping as much as the pastor of Paul's Alley Meeting-house.[1] But they do not say how often they obtrude the subject in many of their pulpits, and dogmatically inculcate their notions in the private circles of their respective neighbourhoods.

4. They sometimes contend that they are right, because there have been, and still are, so many great and good men of their persuasion. The premises are cheerfully conceded; but, the inference is entirely gratuitous; because men of equal piety, learning, and laborious research, in far greater numbers, are against them. Further, how many great and good men have there been in the Romish church; but this is no proof that their system is pure. They also expatiate with delightful satisfaction, on the converts they have received from other denominations, and exhibit their persons as vouchers for the divinity of their cause. But may not Pedobaptists boast of conquests in return, equal in number and intelligence? However, neither side derives any argument for its verity from such additions, any more than Socinians might do, who are never the less unscriptural be-

[1] Wall, v. iii. p. 78.

cause a few Trinitarians lapse into their dogmas. It would be equally invalid to their evidence, were they to imagine that because Jehovah is rendering the ministry of the Baptists very successful in converting sinners, and edifying the church, that he therefore approves of their immersion; since this species of reasoning would apply with equal truth to all other Christian denominations, though differing as widely from the Baptists as the Baptists do from them.

5. You will also often hear immersion advocated in opposition to pouring or sprinkling, because of the greater solemnity of the service. Here the premises are denied. But, had they been true, no argument could have been fairly founded on the fact, that would not have equally applied to a Romish mass or an impious tragedy. A ceremony may be very solemn and yet very unscriptural; or be very simple, and yet all that God requires or approves.

6. Some of them contend, that their mode of baptism is established by the Greek verb, *baptizo;* 'the primary or 'principal meaning of which being to immerse, plunge, or 'dip'—these definitions of it, in many lexicons, preceding the terms to wash, wet, tinge, and the like.[1] But this order is no argument at all, since the last definition of a word, in certain circumstances, exhibits its meaning as fully as the former, and becomes primary in its place according to its connexion in an author. The arrangement is also arbitrary, and varies in different lexicons, as may be discovered by a cursory comparison of them. The case of the verbs *tabal* and *tingo*, synonymous with *baptizo* and each other, to be hereafter noticed, will fully elucidate this sentiment. Nothing but the defence of a desperate cause could influence people to place any such dependence on the mere local

[1] Cox, p. 42, 123.

position of words in a dictionary—much less to make it, as some have done, a principal support of a party question.

7. Among other arguments employed, to induce persons previously baptized by affusion to submit to immersion, is the venality of being twice baptized. Dr. Ryland, in his Candid Statements, frequently preached, has the following sentence: 'If infant baptism was really valid, yet surely the 'error of its being done a second time, can hardly appear a 'very heinous mistake—since he is not about to devote 'himself to another, but to God in Christ.'[1] Consequently, there is no very heinous evil in Anabaptism, though renounced by Mr. Booth with the greatest detestation;[2] and were *we* to baptize by aspersion those who have been previously dipped, it would not be a very heinous mistake.

8. Our brethren also fancy a very solid proof in favour of their system flowing from the abuse of this ordinance among a prominent sect in this country. This perversion, if we are not greatly mistaken, gave being to their system, and now supplies materials for its continuance. But let it be remembered, that such a desecration, as above referred to, is not inseparable from the baptism of children by aspersion, and is not often applied to Protestant Dissenters. Further, we enquire whether the dipping of adults is not liable to an equally pernicious perversion? Look at many around you, who, while enjoying the privileges and fostering the hopes of a Christian, are little better than immersed Antinomians or infidels. Moreover, would our opponents submit the truth and tendency of their respective doctrines and ceremonies to the decision of the use which ignorance, superstition, and impiety may make of them? No, alas! they would justly reply, 'The best things are most abused;

[1] Ryland, p. 27. [2] Booth, vol. ii. p. 97.

nor are the verity and divinity of our opinions and practises at all impeached through their misapplication by fools, libertines, or deists.' Such, in principle, is our answer to the objection.

IX. They frequently express their astonishment, that a doctrine so plain and positive in scripture, as baptismal immersion, should ever be doubted. They think we must be destitute of common sense not to see it, and void of common honesty not to avow it. To demonstrate the astonishing perspicuity and overwhelming force of the arguments in support of their system, some of them very gravely declare, that they were absolutely converted against their will, and that they never would have been Baptists, if they could have helped it! They also tell us, in explicit terms, that 'we have 'not a word to say for infant sprinkling'[1]—that our system is maintained 'by the blindness, prejudice, and, perhaps, 'the perverseness of men—and that people ought to disen-'tangle themselves from the ensnaring influence of our con-'nexion.'[2] Mr. Anderson adds, with much satisfaction, 'that the Baptists are right, cannot reasonably be doubted.'[3] He means we lose the right exercise of our reasoning powers even to question the validity of their scheme. But, probably, we shall be able to make it appear, that all this is based on a little too much confidence in the perfection of their own optical powers and logical faculties; for, surely that cannot be so very glaring, which some of the most holy and intelligent ministers of Christ, seeking and praying for instruction, cannot perceive.[4] In fact, it escapes the observation of more than nineteen, out of twenty, of our countrymen. A respectable and moderate writer, among our oppo-

[1] Booth, vol. ii. p. 486. [2] Maclean, vol. iii. p. 127. [3] Introd. p. 18.
[4] See Booth, vol. iii. p. 182.

nents makes the following assertion :—'The Baptists main-
'tain distinct societies for no other reason than to preserve
'the purity of the baptismal ordinance; and, if a Baptist
'ministry be not supported, the scriptural baptism must,
'without a miracle, be lost.'[1] This evinces the uncommon stress laid on their administration of this ceremony, and the dissimilarity of their mode and subject to those of all other churches in the world, as will be further shown in its place.

x. Mr. Booth remarks, that, 'were one of our oppo-
'nents to publish a history of his own practice, in regard to
'[the *mode* of] baptism, he must either use language dif-
'ferent from that of inspiration, or expose himself to a
'violent suspicion of having deserted the cause he once
'espoused.'[2] But this is not fairly stating the case. Had a person, of Pedobaptist principles, initiated the people into the profession of Christianity at the time, in the country, and under the circumstances mentioned in the New Testament, would not his recital have been similar to that given in the original language of inspiration? We unhesitatingly answer in the affirmative. Let us, in turn, propose a correspondent enquiry to our brethren. Were one of our opponents to publish a history of his own practice, in regard to the *subjects* of baptism, must he not either use language different from that of inspiration respecting this matter; or expose himself to a violent suspicion of having departed from the original institution—and that, too, in cases apparently unaffected by time, place, or circumstances? We reply yes, most assuredly—as their missionary reports bear ample witness.

xi. The zeal displayed by our Baptist brethren in proselyting people to their opinions and practice, is founded

[1] Foot, p. 122, 123. [2] Booth, vol. i. p. 233.

on a principle of action which all consistent persons must commend. But the mode of its operation is not always justifiable. Many ministers and members of their communion are in the habit of seizing upon young and inexperienced converts of other denominations during their incipient state of Christian knowledge and feeling, when easily 'tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of 'doctrine;' and, by bold and positive assertions, appeals to their fears, and promises to their compliance—get numbers of them under water and into their churches, before they are capable of weighing the evidence adduced on either side of the question. 'Some have made it essential to sal-'vation;'[1] and, of course, have pleaded, that no one can go to heaven, except through the baptismal font. This is a method of edifying their cause which symbolizes too much with worldly policy; and being a scheme they would not applaud in us, they cannot expect us to praise it in them. Pedobaptists, however, may take the hint, and better guard their people against the intrusive attacks of their vigilant opponents.

XII. From the irritable manner of many of our opponents, when we approach the baptismal controversy, one might almost conclude, that the doctrine itself was a legitimate monopoly of their communion. To preach on our side of the subject, or otherwise to advocate our views of the sacrament, is frequently regarded as an obtrusive invasion of their prerogative, and a declaration of hostility against their persons. The topic is regarded with so much endearment, that their choler awakes whenever their darling theme is but gently touched by the hand of a stranger. A Baptist, who occasionally attended an Independent chapel,

[1] Evans, &c. p. 126.

flew into a violent passion, declaring himself grossly insulted by the minister's advocating his own views of the doctrine—forgetting that the like is often done by Baptist preachers before Independent contributors, and with at least equal zeal and strength of expression. Whether this feeling arises from fear or excessive self-confidence, may be generally gathered from circumstances. The topic, however, is common property, and all have a right to give their judgment concerning it. We can reason and keep our temper—for our's is not the hostility of an adversary, but a fair and ingenuous investigation of truth—to the obtaining of which, let us implore the unerring guidance of the Holy Spirit.

THE QUESTION AT ISSUE.

Having made the above preliminary observations, we shall now proceed to discuss the following subject:—

WHETHER THE PROPER AND SCRIPTURAL MODE OF ADMINISTERING THE RITE OF CHRISTIAN BAPTISM IN THIS AGE AND COUNTRY, CONSISTS IN APPLYING THE WATER TO THE PERSON IN THE FORM OF POURING OR SPRINKLING; OR IN APPLYING THE PERSON TO THE WATER IN THE FORM OF A TOTAL SUBMERSION?

This latter method is invariably practised by the Antipedobaptists in this nation, and is considered absolutely essential to a valid performance of this Christian ceremony. In their confession of faith, published in 1677, they declare that 'immersion, or dipping of the person in water, is neces-'sary to the due administration of this ordinance.' We, on the contrary, are of opinion that it is not; and further, that

any person, merely immersed in water, is not baptized at all; while those on whom the baptismal element is poured or sprinkled (no matter which) are duly and scripturally baptized. This view of the case we shall endeavour to establish in as simple and concise a manner as the subject will fairly admit.

In prosecuting this enquiry, we shall, *First, state, examine, and confute the arguments of our opponents in support of their exclusive practice; and, Secondly, we shall adduce a variety of circumstantial evidence to prove that our's is the only proper mode of Christian baptism.*

PART FIRST.

WE SHALL STATE, EXAMINE, AND CONFUTE THE ARGUMENTS OF THE BAPTISTS IN SUPPORT OF THEIR EXCLUSIVE SYSTEM OF IMMERSION BAPTISM.

These arguments may be arranged in the following order:—

I. *The natural conclusions of common readers.*
II. *The concessions of numerous Pedobaptists.*
III. *The history of the Christian church.*
IV. *The meaning of the Greek verb baptize.*
V. *The import of four Greek prepositions.*
VI. *The circumstances of the first N. T. baptisms.*
VII. *Several allusions to this scripture rite.*
VIII. *The immutable nature of scripture precedents.*

This arrangement, it is presumed, will do perfect justice to the cause of our opponents, as it embraces a summary of all the arguments adduced in defence of their scheme. A few observations, however, must precede the more immediate consideration of them.

LIBRARY UNIVERSITY CALIFORNIA

1. To render many of our future observations intelligible and pertinent, it will be requisite to bear in mind that our opponents deny in toto the validity of affusion and aspersion baptism—whether administered to infants or adults—and, consequently, pronounce every denomination of Christians, besides themselves, unbaptized. The ultimate aim of all their publications on this topic is the establishment of this proposition. Pedobaptists, in general, have conceded the validity of dipping, either as one species of baptism, or as an admissible substitute for the primitive practice; at the same time contending, that pouring or sprinkling, was an apostolical method; or is now perfectly consonant with the will of the Institutor. We believe, however, and shall attempt to prove, that modern immersion is no Christian baptism at all, and that pouring or sprinkling is exclusively right. A frequent recurrence to this statement will aid you in understanding and applying the ensuing remarks.

11. Our esteemed brethren, would fain make us believe that their practice is supported by positive precepts and the plainest examples. This, however, we deny; and contend that it is upheld only by conjecture and supposition—and defended only by vague statements and illegitimate deductions. It is represented to the world, by its panegyrists, as beauteous in form, and invulnerable to the boldest attacks; while, in truth, it charms but few, and when touched by the wand of demonstration, crumbles into dust. 'I do not 'remember,' says Mr. Elliot, in his 'Dipping not Baptizing,' 'it is any where *said* that the person baptised was covered 'with water, or put under it; and, had this been the case, 'I hardly think the scripture would have been entirely silent 'about it, but in some place or other it would have been *ex*-'*pressly* mentioned; especially if it be a circumstance of such

'importance as some persons suppose and contend for.' The whole system of immersion rests on perhaps and possibility; and, should we be able to adduce a much higher degree of probability against them, their cause, in the estimation of all candid judges, must be lost. For, as an opposing writer justly remarks, 'if in favour of a proposition, not within the 'limits of the strict sciences, a person should adduce a high 'probability, he would be thought to establish his conclu-'sion.'[1]

III. In defending their mode, our opponents incessantly evade the principle of fair argumentation; and constantly support their notions of baptism by a species of reasoning inapplicable to every similar investigation. They pronounce, with unqualified assurance, the divine right of dipping; and behind the impregnable battlements of an unyielding positivity, are proof against every assault of rational investigation and indubitable facts. In other ceremonial matters, positive institutions are modelled or omitted to suit their country and age; but, in this, one iota must not be abated from their fancied form of apostolical order, though decency and health implore it with melting supplications. We feel no need of this inconsistent and ever-shifting method to maintain our cause. Fair, candid, and straight-forward interpretation of scripture, is all we desire—is all our system demands.

IV. The particular ground on which the more intelligent of our brethren erect their dipping hypothesis, is altogether contracted and sandy. The supposed primary meaning of a Greek generic verb, and of four Greek variable prepositions, are the chief, if not entire, basis of their system; as they repeatedly assert, and as will be hereafter verified.

[1] Anderson, p. 11. See p. 19.

We say the *primary* meaning, for they admit that the terms in question, are applied to other actions beside immersing. We say the *supposed* primary meaning; for they have not proved that the act of dipping is an inherent, original, and essential property of the words in dispute—as will also be established in our future observations. Now, we contend that these abstract terms can never settle the question. They tolerate both an application of the element to the object, and of the object to the element—admit of either dipping or sprinkling—but confine the rite to neither. The apostolical practice can only be gathered from circumstances, antecedent, collateral, and immediately following. This view of the case, we purpose not to overlook in any part of the discussion; believing it the only one which is truly legitimate, or properly calculated to bring this long litigated topic to a fair and amicable issue.

v. It will also be found that Baptists, especially in conversation, take a very contracted and partial view of the scripture testimonies respecting this topic. They collect a few isolated texts apparently in their favour, and dwell upon them continually—at the same time passing over, either purposely or ignorantly, a hundred others which form a part of the evidence to be examined by the candid enquirer. John's baptizing in Jordan and Enon—our Lord's coming up out of the water after baptism—Philip and the Eunuch going down into the water and coming up out of it—Paul's expression, 'buried with him by baptism into death,' and the like—are repeatedly adduced with all the exultation of a most signal triumph. But they forget to tell us how John baptized in the wilderness where Christ took up his abode—or how he performed the ceremony in the open air on vast multitudes of men and women, so as to consult decency and health—or how the three thousand were baptized in the city

of Jerusalem in the afternoon of the day of Pentecost—or how we are baptized by the Holy Ghost—or how sprinkling under the law became designated baptism—or how baptism symbolizes with the crucifixion of Christ, &c. Let them look at the subject in all its parts and bearings, and then argue—but not before.

vi. It is sometimes, indeed, amusing, though mortifying, to debate with many of our opponents—for, say what you will, they are sure to be always victorious. If you adduce analogical illustrations, they pronounce them far-fetched and irrellative—if you contemplate the subject in detail, and pursue its various ramifications, they call it a childish splitting of hairs, and unworthy of so grand a theme—if you puzzle them by the production of facts and demonstrations, they assure you that the plainest evidence may be perplexed and mystified by a subtle and disingenuous disputant—if you prove, that it was not likely that a system, so liable to affect the modesty and health of many pious people, should have been instituted by Christ, as a constant and universal sacrament in the church, they redden, and declare you are ridiculing a ceremony of divine appointment, and therefore ought not to be reasoned with any longer—if they feel at a loss for reason or argument to establish any position in favour of their scheme, founded on some particular passage, recourse is immediately had to what we very naturally deem the erroneous expositions of certain Pedobaptists, whose opinions are of no greater weight in our judgment than their own—and if, perchance, they are for a moment foiled in debate, they arise with renewed vigour, encouraging themselves in the delightful thought, that greater men and wiser heads maintain, and, they doubt not, can defend, their practice.—But, we must hasten to investigate the first particular mentioned in our arrangement, viz:—

SECTION FIRST.

THE NATURAL CONCLUSIONS OF COMMON READERS.

It is a common and favourite topic with our respected opponents, that the mode of baptism should be understood in the sense in which plain readers of the New Testament regard it—and that the scriptures would be sadly defective in amplitude and simplicity, if such persons could not, by this means alone, arrive at a correct and satisfactory conclusion about it. 'The round-about logic-labour,' says Mr. Booth, 'which the ploughman has to perform, if he would 'not pin his faith on the sleeve of the learned, is incredible. 'On this plan of proceeding, a plain unlettered man, with 'the New Testament only in his hands, though sincerely 'desirous of learning from his Lord what baptism is, and 'to whom it belongs, is not furnished with sufficient docu-'ments to form a conclusion. No. He must study the 'records of Moses, and well understand the covenant made 'with Abraham. He must study the antiquated rite of 'circumcision. He must know to whom it belonged, and 'the reasons why. Then he must compare it with baptism 'in this, that, and the other particular—after which, he must 'draw a genuine inference, respecting the point in hand, '&c.'[1] This notion is constantly reiterated by the disciples of this sagacious instructor. 'Read,' say our reverend brethren, to their obsequious auditories, 'read only the New Testament, and then decide for yourselves. You need no exposition of men on this subject. You are as competent judges of its nature as the most learned and laborious researchers into the holy oracles. In this way multitudes have been convinced that we are exclusively right—and

[1] Booth, vol. ii. p. 42, 43, 44. See also vol. iii. p. 197, 368. Gibbs, 229-232.

many of them have thus become Baptists even against their will.' With this idea, the raw unlettered 'ploughman,' fancies himself as fully qualified for an umpire of the business as his teacher; and with all the airs and assurance that ignorance ever engendered, declares himself as wise as his betters, not only in this, but, by 'a genuine inference' in all all other religious matters. We must, however, examine this position.

I. This assertion of our opponent's makes nothing for their cause, but induces a result quite the reverse. It is plain beyond dispute, that if the judgment of the populous is formed by simply reading the New Testament in the vernacular tongue, their position is untenable; since a vast majority of common readers decides against their practice, by adopting a contrary one—nor is it fair to charge them with acting inconsistently with their creed, till unquestionable evidence of the fact be produced. If they are previously biassed in favour of either system, as most of them undoubtedly are, it becomes very difficult, perhaps impossible, justly to say how they would have determined, if left entirely to themselves. Had all plain people, without being prejudiced either way, pronounced immersion baptism only agreeable to the word of God, there might have been some plea for the assertion; but, as the case now stands, there is certainly none. The truth is, that by merely reading the scriptures, the commonalty seldom form a settled judgment in this or similar matters. They are first catechised by their private instructors, into the meaning of the word baptize, and then, attaching the communicated notion to the term, believe and act accordingly. May it not be asked, whether it arises solely from a simple and unbiassed perusal of the scriptures, that the hearers of Bap-

tist ministers, and the children of Baptist members, almost wholly and exclusively become Baptists? If they are not prejudiced by the expository lectures of their respective teachers, how happens this phenomenon in the religious world? Of what value, then, is all this parade about the natural conclusions of common readers in favour of dipping? Nor is one at a loss to account for the prevalence of our opponent's principles and practice among those who, though really intelligent and pious, exclusively attend their ministry, or read only their publications on this subject—much less are we surprized that 'the illiterate ploughman,' the obsequious negroes of the West Indies, and the ardent youths, newly awakened—who only read their pamphlets, only hear their declamations, and often witness the important position of those that undergo the ceremony—should long to be equally religious, equally submissive, and equally signalized among their neighbours. An opposite result would be far more mysterious and insoluble. From such a positive and reiterated statement of doctrines, thousands are fully convinced, not only that immersion is proper, but that the heresies of Socinus and Mahomet are right. He must be a stranger to the church and the world, who is not fully convinced, that the generality of people read their Bibles with the spectacles of their teacher, and understand them in the sense which his sagacity or ignorance dictates. The merit or demerit of such conduct we must leave to the umpirage and correction of our opponents.

II. It is manifest to the weakest capacity, that the conclusions of common English readers are founded entirely on the terms and phrases adopted by the translators of the sacred writings. This sentiment is, in fact, conceded even by the last-cited author. 'Let but the word *baptizontes*,' says

he, 'be fairly translated into plain English, [namely, to 'immerse,] as the other words of the sacred statute are; and 'the most illiterate person, if he can read his own language, 'may find both the qualifications for baptism, and the proper 'mode of administration, expressly contained in the law it-'self.'[1] Now, on this principle, if in one country, as at Serampore,[2] the original word *baptizo* is rendered to dip, in another to pour, and in a third to sprinkle, the plain illiterate ploughmen of those respective places would conclude accordingly, and dip, pour, or sprinkle, in conformity to the letter of their different Bibles. In like manner, if the prepositions, we shall subsequently investigate, in connexion with the baptism of Christ and the Eunuch, were rendered to and from the water, instead of into and out of the water, as they fairly might be—would they not conclude, that the baptized probably never went into the element at all to receive this rite? The translators of the authorized English version of our Bible were evidently biassed in favour of immersion through their long association with the Romish church—'the ancient practice of which,' Messrs. Birt and Dore tell us, 'was to dip;'[3] or, in consequence of their veneration for the fathers of the third and fourth centuries, in whose time immersion, with various other unscriptural rites of baptism, was practised in many cases as, at least, a prefatory part of the ceremony; and they consequently gave the verb and prepositions the sense which accorded with, what we presume to designate, their mistaken sentiments. Of similar perversions, our opponents loudly complain in other notorious instances.[4] To those who would object to an examination of the original language of scripture for

[1] Booth, vol. iii. p. 197.
[2] Cong. Mag. March, 1830.
[3] Birt's Vind. p. 21; Dore's Pref. p. 17.
[4] Booth, vol. iii. p. 261.

illustrating the subject before us, we would reply, in the language of Dr. Pye Smith—'It would seem superfluous to 'express a caution against arguing from any translation of 'the scriptures, as if it were the original; but, it must be con- 'fessed, that not only unlearned Christians, but some men 'of respectable education, have fallen into this *egregious* '*error*.'[1]—It will be rendered apparent, that the most generally appropriate translation of the word baptize, as religiously employed in the New Testament, is to sanctify, consecrate, purify, initiate, or some other term of an equally indefinite sense. Supposing, then, the verb had been thus rendered, in the narratives of scripture-baptism, would the illiterate ploughman, in that case, arrive at the invariable conclusion, that it means always and only to dip or immerse the whole body? Certainly not—especially if the prepositions were translated in harmony with such a general import of the verb. Hence it is evident, that the opinions of the illiterate depend on the words employed by the learned; and this argument in favour of dipping amounts to nothing.

III. If the decision of common readers be correct in one instance, why not in all? or who is to arbitrate as to the subjects precisely within the range of their unaided comprehension? And if every thing in theology be really so plain to the judgment of the ploughman and mechanic, as to render their decisions a criterion of biblical truth, on what pretence of necessity or advantage are all their lectures on divinity, or commentaries on the scriptures, or of what utility are all their volumes and pamphlets so industriously circulated on the baptismal controversy, or why do they support colleges and educate men to explain the

[1] Messiah, v. i. p. 57,

gospel? On the ground that the word of God is so very plain to the lower classes of our countrymen, all this book-making, academical tuition, and oral instruction, go for nothing—in fact, they do mischief—for as the learned and ignorant mostly see things in a different light, on the presumption that the latter are good judges, the former must be bad ones. The truth is, that ignorance places a person in a state of mental dependence on the knowledge and integrity of his intelligent fellow-creatures. As one of our opponents judiciously remarks, 'an illiterate man determines on the matter from the testimony of others, whom, 'by his condition, he is obliged to trust.'[1] And if this be the case in the present day, how much more must it have been in former and feudal times, when a Bible would have cost the poor man the entire proceeds of fifteen years' labour[2] —when barons and bishops could not, with few exceptions, write their names[3]—and when an ability to read, as late as in the sixteenth century, conferred on the greatest culprits pardon, or, in law phraseology, the benefit of clergy?[4] But even admitting the mental competency of the poor for eliciting the mind of the Spirit with unerring precision, it must be conceded, that the time usually and necessarily consumed in providing for their temporal wants, and the lassitude of mind generally induced by their muscular avocations, almost entirely prevent their solving the difficulties found in the scriptures; among which, that involving the mode of baptism, is certainly not the least. It should be further remarked, that this capability of comprehending the scriptural mode of baptism, is not confined by our antagonists to persons of certain specific attainments in knowledge.

[1] Rob. Hist. p. 5. [2] Townley's Bib. Anecd. p. 139.
[3] Robt. Hist. Ch. V. vol. I. p. 214, note r. [4] Kaime's Sk. of Man, v. I. p. 92.

Any illiterate person, who can read the New Testament, or, which amounts to the same thing, who has ears to hear another read it, is perfectly qualified to form an unerring conclusion. Nor is piety requisite. An individual, seriously desirous of knowing the primitive practice, whatever be his motives, is, with the New Testament in his hand, a competent umpire in this controversy. Hence the poor illiterate Pedobaptist is every way as good a judge in this cause as Mr. Booth, or any of his colleagues or successors, however great their literary attainments, or deep their piety toward God!

IV. While every thing really fundamental in faith and morals may be easily gathered from revelation by pious, intelligent, and attentive readers in common life, the modes, customs, and ceremonies, to which constant allusion is made in the Old and New Testaments, must be matters of doubt, and frequently of inexplicable difficulty, to such persons. The Greek or Jew, who lived in the times and places in which the scriptures were composed, understood the references to rites and manners daily practised before his eyes, much more easily than the abstract doctrines of inspiration. But plain, uneducated Englishmen, whose climate and customs are widely different from those of the east two or three thousand years ago, can comprehend the doctrines best. Indeed, without the assistance derived from early or contemporary writings, and the later researches of the enterprising and observant traveller—even ministers themselves must remain exceedingly ignorant of many expressions found in the holy oracles. Nor are our opponents backward in availing themselves of such auxiliaries, and that to the greatest extent, of which Dr. Gill's Exposition of the Bible affords us remarkable and splendid illustrations.

Hence Taylor's 'Fragments to Calmet's Dictionary,' Harmer's 'Observations on Various Passages of Scripture,' and Burder's 'Oriental Customs,' shed more light over many obscure portions of inspiration, respecting ancient rites and ceremonies, than all the erudite conjectures of every schoolman in Europe. How absurd, therefore, is it to talk of the untutored ploughman construing the difficulties of the sacred volume with all the unerring judgment of infallibility.

V. To reply, as some of our respected opponents have done,[1] that this obscurity of scripture, respecting the definitive forms of positive institutions, would, if true, greatly impeach the wisdom and benevolence of its author—is an objection void of the smallest weight, and made only amidst the desperate perplexities of an untenable, though darling, position. That there are inexplicable difficulties to illiterate minds, palpable facts have placed beyond the possibility of rational debate. And those who would presumptuously arraign the wisdom and benevolence of God, for not making his word otherwise, must contend with heaven, and marshal their notions against the knowledge of the Omnipotent. They might as justly reason, that Jehovah ought to have imparted human skill and information alike to every youth without parental or other tuition—or, that the superior bounties of providence should have been afforded equally to mankind, though thousands exert greater energies of mind and body than others, to secure them. How would the objector have rebuked the Son of God for speaking in parables, that his audience, 'seeing, might not perceive, and 'hearing, might not understand the mysteries of the king-'dom!' (Mark iv. 11, 12.) Has not the Saviour established a gospel ministry for instructing the ignorant—and

[1] Burt, p. 18; Booth, vol. i. p. 84, 85, 105, 231.

afforded them minds capable of being thus educated in the revealed will of their Maker? And has he not thereby perfectly justified his procedure against the charge of wanting wisdom and benevolence in denying the idle and ignorant every advantage afforded to the industrious and cultivated portions of his rational creatures?

VI. When our opponents condemn as extraneous and improper any reference to human authorities, for elucidating the import of the Greek word baptize, or to the customs of the country in which the scriptures were written, for attesting the analogy of our proceedings with the intention of the sacred writers[1]—they display a very considerable degree of ignorance, or destitution of candour. They must know, one would suppose, that this is the only method by which, under certain provisoes to be hereafter mentioned, all ancient and foreign writers can be fairly understood—and this is a principle adopted by all the compositors of lexicons designed to explain the New Testament. The slightest inspection of the valuable works of Parkhurst, Schleusner, and others, will evince the truth of our observation. They also involve in their censure some of the most eminent and holy men of their own denomination,[2] who have adopted this plan in hope of supporting their interest. Even these very objectors eagerly refer to writers Heathen or Christian, Popish or Protestant, whenever they discover the least plausible hint or argument in maintenance of their sentiments. A fair and rational investigation of the subject, is all we require, and the use of those legitimate means in our defence which our esteemed brethren employ in theirs, and in conducting and determining all similar enquiries. To deny us these, betrays a feeling which they can best

[1] Booth, vol. ii. p. 42-44; vol. iii. p. 197, 368. [2] Apology, p. 400-415.

explain. In fact, as one of their recent writers observes, 'every competent and impartial judge will admit, that the 'true signification of a Greek word must be determined by 'its current use among Greek authors, especially when that 'use of the word is supported by the universal consent of 'the most distinguished scholiasts and grammarians.'[1]

VII. There are some of our opponents who even object to any reference to the Old Testament, for illustrating the topic under discussion. They would make us believe, that Christianity is totally different from Judaism, and forms a new and distinct religion in the world, and that to go back to the ancient dispensations, in order to understand a Christian rite, is 'unnecessary, presumptuous,'[2] and ridiculous—and yet our reverend brethren, who are truly ministers of the gospel, frequently select texts from Moses and the prophets, and preach the gospel from them. They often refer to those writings to explain or confirm the sayings of Christ and his apostles—and laboriously investigate the Old Testament for the sake of enforcing the New. They, in fact, as frequently direct our attention to the institutions of the Old Testament, in supporting their views of baptism, as do the Pedobaptists themselves. Mr. Booth, whose sentiments on this head have been previously cited,[3] stands foremost in adducing this species of referential argumentation.[4] Such allusions are proper and requisite. For how is the epistle to the Hebrews to be understood without a knowledge of the Levitical economy? And how many other portions of the new covenant are inexplicable without a reference to the prophecies of the old? Did the apostles never explain their rites, doctrines, and duties, by an appeal to the scriptures

[1] Gibbs, p. 51; Gill, p. 223. [2] Booth, v. ii. p. 42; Dore, p. 11; Gibbs, p. 228.
[3] Page 47. [4] Apology, p. 400-415, &c. &c.

of truth, before any part of the gospels or epistles were written? In 1 Cor. v. 7, 8, the apostle says, 'Purge out 'therefore, the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump— 'therefore let us keep the feast—not with old leaven, neither 'with the leaven of malice and wickedness—but with the 'unleavened bread of sincerity and truth.' 'Who,' says a learned author, 'can adequately understand this reference 'unless he have some acquaintance with the pains taken by 'the Jews to cleanse their houses from leaven? And how 'many things are there in Christianity, on which a plain 'unlettered man needs almost perpetual assistance?'[1] And, if it be an allowed practice in other matters, with what propriety could Mr. Dore assume, as in the place before quoted, that, 'in this case we have nothing to do with the Old 'Testament—as baptism is an ordinance, not of Moses, 'but of Christ.' Are our Baptist friends afraid of the light which the law and the prophets shed over this Christian ceremony? If not, why make the objection?

VIII. But, as the position we are combatting, strikes at the root of all ministerial expository labours, it may be proper to enquire whether the illiterate ploughman would be the person selected by our opponents to lecture on the Song of Solomon—to unfold the mysteries of the Apocalypse—to establish the fulfilment of ancient prophecy—or to explain the numerous metaphorical expressions of the sacred writings? To reply, that the doctrine of baptism is of simpler solution, is also begging the question. Besides, the instructions of the pulpit are enforced by the strongest commands and the clearest examples in the word of God. When Christ gave his final commission to the apostles, he bade them *teach* all nations. (Matt. xxviii. 20.)

[1] Taylor's Facts and Evidences, lett. ii. p. 2.

When he arose from the dead, he *expounded* the scriptures to his disciples in their way to Emmaus. (Luke xxiv. 27.) Paul went into the synagogue at Thessalonica, and reasoned with the audience out of the scriptures, *opening* and alledging that Christ must needs have suffered. (Acts xvii. 3, 4.) In the same manner he instructed his hearers, in his own hired house at Rome. (Acts xxviii. 23.) But, if the unlearned, who so often wrest all the scriptures to their destruction, (2 Peter iii. 16,) are such competent judges in determining the precise import of inspiration, all these commands and examples are entirely nugatory. In a word, if our opponents were, in all cases, to act consistently with the objection we have now considered, they would, as before hinted, demolish their colleges, burn their theological books, the Bible excepted, and set aside the ministry among them. And, till this be done, we may fairly conclude that this pillar of their scheme, is a mere subterfuge, and is little better than a reed shaken with the wind, and broken by the slightest touch of the feeblest antagonist.

SECTION SECOND.

THE CONCESSIONS OF NUMEROUS PEDOBAPTISTS.

Mr. Booth, following the example of Messrs. D'Anvers and Keach, as if conscious that his cause was defective in argument, and required another species of prop to preserve it from falling, has collected and arranged a formidable list of extracts from different writers of various Pedobaptist denominations, and founded various reflexions and hypotheses upon them, in order to prove that, in the opinion of his opponents, he and his brethren are exclusively right, and that

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Christians ought always and only to dip all they baptize.[1] This was certainly an ingenious thought, calculated to puzzle his weaker antagonists, and to encourage his ardent abettors. The work is the result of immense reading, and is executed with considerable ability. Out of this collation, several minor publications have been made; and few Baptist ministers address their congregations on the subject in debate, without retailing a long catalogue of these quotations, and laying a ponderous stress upon them. A few observations, however, will show that our opponents have gained little in appearance, and nothing in reality, from this mode of aggression.

I. This species of argumentation not being always, and in all respects, improper, the following postulates should be duly considered, in order to form a correct judgment of this kind of quotation.

1. The obnoxious citations to which we allude, differ materially from such as are made for the purpose of exhibiting the objections to be combatted by a writer, or merely for determining the precise line of concord and contention between the opposing parties. The latter are absolutely necessary to all polemical discussions—the former, however congenial to our minds, are not so.

II. The quotations themselves must be founded in argument and capable of moral demonstration; and not the mere opinion or dogma of the authors—for otherwise they are of no real validity, and become subject to examination and correction as much as the sentiment they are adduced to corroborate.

III. The doctrine to be established, should be capable of decisive proof without these citations—since, if it were not,

[1] Booth, vol. i. p. 44-69.

suspicion might be naturally raised, that the ignorance or inadvertency of an opponent, is the chief foundation of this inferential hypothesis.

IV. These quotations can only be adduced, with any thing like equity or effect, against such as make them, and are thereby liable to a retort—or against those who, in some way, acknowledge their validity—others are not affected by them, being left entirely free and unshackled to enter the arena of disputation.

V. They should, in all cases be extracted from those works in which the writers avowedly treat on the controverted subject, and wherein they express themselves with caution—fully conscious, from the past agitation of the question, of the use or abuse which may be made of them, and never from apparently careless or incidental expressions.

VI. Properly to serve the cause of the person who cites them, they should only and entirely maintain the point immediately to be established—neither more nor less—since, if this be not the case, they are no fair support of this design—and retailing them is calculated to excite considerable misapprehensions in the mind of the unwary reader.

VII. The quotations should not directly and fully advocate the ultimate object of the person that makes them—since they are then to be regarded no longer as concessions of opponents, but the opinions of friends—an indirect admission of certain data or principles, from which the point at issue can be deduced, being the only legitimate evidence of this nature. As few, it is presumed, will object to these postulates, it remains that Mr. Booth's citations should be brought to the test—and which we shall therefore proceed to do.

II. Now, the concessions collected by Mr. Booth, being

merely the opinions of the Pedobaptist referred to, are as subject to examination and correction, as the assertions of the Baptists themselves. Suppose between ninety and a hundred of Mr. Booth's own denomination had inadvertently admitted that the ancient mode of performing the ceremony in question was by pouring or sprinkling—and, suppose these concessions had been collated and urged by us, as an unquestionable proof, that in the opinion of the Baptists, our practice was scriptural and exclusively valid—would not this reverend gentleman, and his more wary brethren, have replied, 'we rely no more on the opinions and dogmas of our blundering and inconsistent fraternity, when contradicting our own particular sentiments, than of those in any other communion?' For, as Dr. Gale justly observes, 'however great and honourable the patrons of a mistake 'may be, they are but men, and the authority of Christ, and 'the respect and obedience we owe to his commands, should 'counterbalance all other considerations.'[1] 'For you must 'know,' says Mr. Keach, 'that men, though ministers, are 'not your rule of faith, but God's word.'[2] Had the Pedobaptists brought arguments to show that immersion was not only the ancient mode of baptism, but that it was proper and necessary now, the case would have been materially different—for then their remarks would have been entitled to a consideration which their mere opinions by no means merit. But this they have not done, and could not honestly do—and if they had, we must have regarded them as genuine Antipedobaptists in principle, though not in practice—and the idea of concession would have been out of the question.[3]

III. Our opponents, however, with their sentiments on

[1] Gale, p. 178. [2] Keach, Pref. p. 13. [3] See Booth, vol. iii. p. 68.

this subject, must regard the writers they cite with so much confidence, and on whose concessions so much stress is laid, as exceedingly weak or as absolute hypocrites—believing one thing to be a divine obligation, and practising the very reverse—deeming immersion-baptism exclusively scriptural and proper, and yet sprinkling or affusing their converts. Of what real value, therefore, can the sayings of such persons be in the esteem of our brethren? The authors referred to are not said indirectly to surrender certain positions which, by deduction, are the pillars of the immersion scheme, but openly and directly to pronounce this method only scriptural and right. Such certainly is the impression intended to be made on the mind of the persons perusing Mr. Booth's volumes. The divines, whose writings are cited, either baptized by pouring or sprinkling, or they did not. If they did, and yet pronounce dipping only valid or divine, according to our opponents' notions of positive institutes, they were undoubtedly a weak and rebellious body of men, contradicting and condemning their own constant and deliberate practice—and surely their evidence cannot be of any very great value in the esteem of our Baptist brethren. If, on the other hand, they performed this rite by immersion, we must view them as genuine Antipedobaptists, and their conceding declarations as the assertions of real antagonists. On the former supposition, which we are taught to receive as correct, Mr. Booth makes the following observation:—'Now, is it not strange—strange to astonish-'ment—that so many eminent men should thus agree in 'bearing testimony to immersion as the apostolic example, 'when it is notorious that their own practice was very dif-'ferent—just so the Papists.'[1] Moreover, these supposed

[1] Booth, vol. i. p. 225. See also vol. iii. p. 68.

advocates for dipping were not only erroneous in sprinkling while they considered immersion only apostolic and proper, but they were so very ignorant of this plain and positive right, or so refractory in their conduct towards their Lord and Master, as to sprinkle unconscious babes instead of believing adults. They must, in the judgment of our opponents, have been excessively imbecile in intellect, or uncommonly perverse in their proceedings—rendering the clear and immutable commands of Christ altogether nugatory—and yet these are the persons whose dogmas are collected with so much diligence, and disseminated with so much zeal, as the imperishable basis and impregnable bulwarks of their beloved system!

IV. Nor is this reasoning without analogy in the works of our respected opponents. Dr. Williams, having cited a passage in support of his practice from Mr. Elliott, a Menonite Baptist, who pleads for adult baptism by pouring or sprinkling only,[1] Mr. Booth makes the following reply:—'So extremely fond of concession is Dr. W. that he 'classes a number of persons under the character of Anti-'pedobaptists, who professedly differ as much from us, as 'they do from himself in respect of the subject; and ought, 'therefore, on both sides, to be left out of the question.'[2]—Or, to simplify the sentence, 'it is not proper to receive concessions on the Baptist controversy from those who, both in mode and subject, do not perfectly agree with the party opposed.' Now, if this be valid argumentation in the esteem of our brethren, then all Mr. Booth's quotations from the Quakers, whom he denominates his 'impartial friends,' stand for nothing, since these good people, by differing as much from us as from Mr. Booth, in denying the propriety

[1] Antipedobaptism Exam. vol. ii. p. 119-135. [2] Booth, vol. iii. p. 53.

of water-baptism altogether, and thus rendering themselves erroneous in our mutual opinion, 'ought, therefore, to be left 'out of the question;' and as most, if not all, the Pedobaptists cited by Mr. Booth in defence of dipping, differed, at least, in *opinion* as much from us in respect of the mode (if their concessions are worth our opponents a straw), as they did from Mr. Booth, in regard of the subjects of baptism, 'they ought, on both sides, to be left out of the ques-'tion,' as incompetent umpires of this debate. But, perhaps, the most inconsistent part of the business is the enlisting of Jeremy Taylor on their side of the qestion. The bishop, though deeming the Baptists 'deceived,'[1] to show what might be said for a bad cause, adduced a few arguments in their favour; but which to himself appeared sophistical, and such as no person of judgment or penetration would accredit;[2] and yet his lordship is referred to and republished[3] as making concessions of vast importance to the Baptist argument. In fact, if the method of Dr. Williams were objectionable in the smallest degree, Mr. Booth's is a hundred times more so.

V. It will be made perfectly apparent, in the course of our future observations, that, in conformity to an equitable interpretation of the holy oracles, and in accordance with the universal practice of our opponents in all other theological discussions, persons might believe that to dip is one, or even the primary, meaning of the word baptize, or that immersion was originally enjoined and practised in the Christian church, and yet be still honest and consistent Pedobaptists—performing the rite by aspersion. This, in many cases, is undoubtedly the fact. Various divines, who administer the rite in question in the manner observed by ourselves, do suppose

[1] P. 40. [2] See Hammond's Six Queries. [3] By Mr. Anderson.

that dipping constituted, at least, a part of the primitive mode; but that the precise manner of applying the element to the object, is no more fixed and immutable than the circumstantials of the Lord's supper; first celebrated by a dozen males only, on a Thursday evening, in an upper room, in a reclining posture, and with unleavened bread—or than the tokens of friendship and hospitality, consisting in a kiss of charity and washing one another's feet—or than the mode of recovering the sick, by anointing him with oil, and praying over him in the name of the Lord. If our opponents conceive that all Pedobaptists, who have unwittingly conceded that the ancient mode was partly or wholly by immersion, are consequently favourable to dipping in the present age and country, and that, after such acknowledgments, they have nothing left in defence of their own practice, they will be greatly deceiving themselves, and boasting of company which, upon a little explanation, will entirely forsake them.

VI. But we have no hesitation in saying, that such fatal concessions, as our opponents pretend to adduce, have never been made by Pedobaptists, and that the authors referred to have been very unfairly treated. A superficial examination of the case will show, that many of the quotations are exceedingly partial and distorted—the truth is but partly told—extracts are improperly made—and a stress is laid on words and phrases which the original writers never intended. The impression designed to be made on the reader evidently is, 'that immersion was only and always the original practice, and as such should be invariably adopted now—that the word baptize means only and always to dip—and that in this sense we are constantly to construe it in the present day.' For, though Mr. Booth

has prefaced his citations with a couple of provisionary clauses, which necessity obliged him to write, and which are soon forgotten by common readers of his numerous extracts—the design was to make them believe that the authors sanctioned his practice. Indeed, nothing less than this, on the plan of his volumes, would answer his purpose. But where have such concessions been made? Let our opponents produce them, if they are able. It is absurd to imagine such to be attainable. Pedobaptists readily admit, that the word baptize is sometimes employed for dipping, sinking, and drowning, as well as for washing, pouring, or sprinkling; but this is consonant with their views of aspersion baptism. They have erroneously conceded, that the apostles sometimes baptized by dipping the person partially or wholly—but does this prove, that they thought such a method requisite now and in this country? Where is the Protestant Pedobaptist who has deliberately said that pouring or sprinkling of children or adults is not a real and valid baptism? In fact, to suppose that they have intentionally advocated a system in books, which they condemned in practice, is preposterous. Mr. Booth is forced to admit the truth of our observations. He says, 'many of the following 'quotations are to be considered as concessions of these 'learned authors—no inconsiderable part [indeed all] of 'them asserting, notwithstanding what they here say, that 'the word baptism signifies pouring and sprinkling as well 'immersion.'[1] Again, 'though these numerous and learned 'authors have expressed themselves in the following man-'ner, many [why not say all?] of them insist upon it as 'highly probable, that the apostles did sometimes adminis-'ter baptism by pouring or sprinkling.'[2] And yet these are

[1] Booth, vol. i. p. 44. [2] Ibid, vol. i. p. 191.

the authorities adduced as directly supporting the cause of dipping exclusively !

VII. Mr. Booth's mode of maintaining his cause by direct concession, is not only very suspicious, but very exceptionable ; and, employed against himself, respecting his doctrines and discipline, would be deemed very uncharitable. Suppose the followers of Faustus Socinus, or of John Agricola, were to ransack the writings of our Antipedobaptist brethren of various denominations, and to cull a line here, a sentence there, and a paragraph elsewhere, and to lay an emphasis on words and expressions not originally emphatic, to make the public believe that ' these numerous ' and learned authors' were direct and avowed abettors of Socinianism or Antinomianism, or conceded the verity of these heresies—would not some one of our opponents arise with indignation and repel the iniquitous insinuations, by saying—' Gentlemen, this is really too bad. You know perfectly well, that the authors you have cited, never entertained your sentiments, and that their conduct and compositions, honestly construed, prove my assertion. Even though their words may be capable of a construction, by an ingenious antagonist, favourable to your practice, their genuine opinions were certainly against it. You impose on your credulous readers by such glaring perversions of other men's works. Though they have incautiously stated their doctrines, and inadvertently offered a handle to their wily adversaries, it is impossible to suppose they were favourable to your heretical notions—and your cause must be sadly destitute of fair and solid argument and yourselves of integrity, before you would enlist them under your standard as advocates of your unscriptural interest.' What our opponents would reply to the Socinian or Antinomian, with a slight

modification, we may say to them. Such modes of defence may puzzle the weak and, perhaps, convince the ignorant, but they must be viewed with suspicion by the serious and intelligent. Those who could support their scheme by just and honourable means, would never have recourse to one so exceptionable and subject to such suspicions. It is, in fact, liable to perpetual and unlimited perversion. Writers, with feeble arguments, are always anxious to obtain the countenance of others as a guarantee with the public that their opinions are valid. It is on this principle that the fathers, reformers, and orthodox authorities of the church have recently been marshalled in maintenance of the heterodox notions of universal restoration and the sinful character of the human nature of the Son of God.

VIII. One of our principal objections to Mr. Booth's volumes, consists in his effort to persuade us that the citations made, directly concede the whole point at issue between us; or that their authors are ostensible advocates of immersion, while adopting a contrary mode of baptism. No person can peruse his work, and those of his humble imitators, nor hear his pages detailed in the pulpits of our Baptist brethren, without feeling this to be the entire drift of the argument. Against indirect acknowledgments, as specified in our seventh postulate, and applied according to the fourth, no fair objection can be taken. And, on this principle of indirect concession, we may ask with confidence, if our opponents have not surrendered every pillar and ground of their exclusive scheme of dipping? Have they not admitted that the word baptize, which they pronounce the principal subject of contention, is often employed to express an action in which the element is applied to the object in the form of staining, pouring, or sprinkling?

—Have they not told us it signifies to bury, and that this act consists in casting earth upon the corpse?—that it means to overwhelm, which is done by the superincumbence of some oppressive weight?—Have they not conceded, that the real waters of Jordan nor the imaginary floods of Enon, were necessary for baptism, since a bath or pool, three feet deep, would have been equally convenient?—that going down into the water up to the neck is not baptism, nor any proof of its administration?—that to be dipped is to take up the cross, being sometimes attended with indecorum and danger?—and that when Paul speaks of being 'buried in baptism,' he had no reference to any such act as an English interment?—all which will be shown in the sequel, with much more, to the same effect. Now this is indirect concession, established by indisputable facts, and found amidst the guarded expressions of their polemical volumes.

IX. But there is another concession made by our opponents perfectly in character with the preceding, and an indirect surrender of those principles on which their exclusive system of immersion is founded. By adopting the plan of OPEN COMMUNION, they practically concede the validity of our baptism, as respects both the mode and the subject. As they profess to act only from plain examples or apostolical precepts, and as they can find neither in the New Testament for receiving persons to the Lord's table after Christian baptism was instituted, who, in the judgment of the first Christians, were not baptized, we must take it for granted, notwithstanding all their evasions on this subject, that they consider Pedobaptists really baptized—for, dipping them a hundred times over, would not introduce them to another religious association or privilege. Nor is this species of reasoning without precedent in the works of our

opponents.—'I must confess myself,' says Mr. Burt, 'exceedingly mistaken, if all communions in England do not 'acknowledge immersion to be the true mode, since they 'will admit any orderly communicant of our's to partake 'with them at the Lord's table, without calling in question 'the validity of their baptism—though they would fain persuade us that their's is baptism too.'[1] That is, admission to the Lord's table is deemed a test of being duly baptized in the judgment of those who admit them. The scheme of receiving unbaptized persons to the sacramental table of those who continually talk of nothing but divine precepts and apostolical examples, simply on the ground that they consider themselves baptized, is, at least, a great inconsistency, and was evidently formed ulterior to such a reception, for the purpose of increasing their party. This principle is calculated to subvert all church order, and tends to annihilate the authority of the minister—since any person, fancying himself converted, without giving any real proofs of it, must be received as a Christian, merely because he imagines himself one; or, if a person were sprinkled with sand, as the Jew, mentioned by Mr. Booth, if he thought it sufficient baptism, he must be accepted. According to this scheme, the qualification of the candidate rests with himself, and not as Dr. Gill asserts 'solely in the breast of the administrator.'[2] Now, as we cannot suppose this inconsistency in our opponents, we are constrained to believe in their mental as well as practical admission of the validity of infant sprinkling.

X. But, while vindicating the consistency of our opponents in one respect, we are constrained to expose their incongruity in another. The majority of the Antipedobaptists

[1] Treatise, p. 19. [2] Gill's Body of Div. vol. iii. b. 3. c. 1.

are advocates for STRICT COMMUNION; and consequently will suffer no Pedobaptist to sit down with them at the Lord's table, because, in their opinion, he has not been baptized. In this they act in harmony with their own scheme of interpreting the sacred volume in respect of positive institutions—seeing, as said before, they can find no precedent in the New Testament for admitting people to this sacrament who, in the judgment of the apostles, were not scripturally baptized. These very persons, however, will admit Pedobaptists into their pulpits and listen with delight to their discourses—will cordially unite with them in prayer and singing the praises of God. But can they find any precedent for such a practice? Did the apostles adopt or sanction such a procedure? Will our brethren point out an instance in which the first and inspired ministers of Christ tolerated persons, whom they deemed unbaptized, to preach in their churches, or to lead the devotional services of their solemn assemblies? However other denominations might act in this matter, our opponents, on their principles, are, as Mr. Booth asserts, 'strangely inconsistent,'[1] 'because to a 'positive precept, or an apostolic example, the votaries of 'this innovation do not pretend.'[2] There are cases in which Baptists will sit down at the Lord's table in our churches, while they would not suffer a Pedobaptist to sit down with them at the sacrament in their's. In some congregations of our respected opponents, there are two distinct churches under the same pastor, and two distinct communions in which the Lord's Supper is administered alternately—and this, of course, is apostolic! Our Baptist brethren say, 'we will hear with you—we will pray and sing with you, and the like—but you must eat by yourselves.'

[1] Apology, p. 354. [2] Booth, vol. ii. p. 514.

XI. As it is possible that some persons present, not much initiated into the mysteries of polemical discussions, after listening to our future observations and frequent references to the works of our opponents, may suppose that, while denouncing Mr. Booth's principle of quotation, we have adopted the same in maintaining our cause; we beg, therefore, to make a few remarks, to show that the cases are widely different, and that the preceding postulates fully sanction our procedure, while they condemn the conduct of Mr. Booth and his numerous imitators.

I. The citations made from the works of our Baptist brethren, are designed to state their objections, erroneous reasonings, and grounds for immersion—wherein we agree and differ—what are their views of certain data of evidence—and how far their indirect testimony corroborates our sentiments.

II. The quotations, relevant to our ultimate object, are such as rest on a firm and unyielding foundation—and the sentiments are capable of a clear establishment, entirely irrespective of the author's, from whose writings they are taken—or arguments, rather than mere opinions, are the substance of our references.

III. Our positions, also, shall be capable of standing alone, disjointed from every collateral proof derived from the writings of our opponents—so that if every quotation from their volumes were expunged, our arguments would be left as entire and as tenable as with them.

IV. Such passages, only, are taken from Baptist publications, as appear to be the approved declarations of the whole body—and not the dogmas of a small part of their communion—and, from the force of which, some might shield themselves by the peculiaritiy of their baptismal sentiments.

v. Our extracts are made almost exclusively from the works composed expressly in maintenance of their baptismal principles—and which evidently bear the characters of care and caution, and display a consciousness of the use or abuse an opponent may make of them.

vi. The authors are fairly and fully cited—no sense is attached to their remarks discordant with their deliberate intention; and they are applied to the support of propositions, for the upholding of which they are honestly calculated—nothing like the perversion of a writer will be discovered in any of our evidence *ad hominem*.

vii. If any thing like concession be urged, it will be of data, or principles of reasoning, or the indirect surrender of certain points; from yielding up which, the ulterior object of our investigation may be inferred, and not the direct concession of the whole point at issue between us.

These regulations, being properly observed, no just parallel can be fairly drawn between the method adopted by Mr. Booth, his predecessors, or copyists, and that observed in this dissertation. They will be found, by every judicious and candid observer, as different as darkness and day—as deception and ingenuousness. Even if our professed principles of quotation were inadvertently transgressed, our opponents, who in general look to Mr. Booth as the champion of their cause, would have little reason to complain. In fact, were we to cancel all concession on both sides, and to argue the question uninfluenced by preceding controversy, we feel confident as to the result—or, admitting them from each party in all their original evidence, our hopes of success would be equally sanguine.

SECTION THIRD.

THE HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

Our Baptist brethren assure us, that the plainest and most ample evidence is derivable from ecclesiastical history that dipping was the universal mode of administering baptism in ancient times.[1] A triumphant reference is made to the Greek church, in which trine immersion is practised; and to the rubric of the Church of England, which enjoins dipping as well as sprinkling. The validity of these allusions we shall now proceed to examine.

I. We would enquire, if our opponents are agreed among themselves, or have formed individual opinions, respecting the precise manner in which this rite was performed in the primitive churches, immediately succeeding the apostolic era? Let them answer, if they can, the following questions: —Were the people dipped only, or also sprinkled?—Were they naked or dressed?—Was single or trine immersion practised?—Was the ceremony administered in natural reservoirs of water or in artificial baptistries?—If in fonts, how were they constructed?—Who officiated on the occasion—an ordained minister or acting deacons?—Let them also say, whether in the first two or three centuries after the apostolic age, the mode of baptism was the same at all times and in all places?—If not, which portion of Christendom preserved incorrupt the original institution?—And on what age of the period in question do they fix, as affording the purest model for the imitation of the present generation?—Before historical evidence can be pleaded with any degree of propriety, it is but fair to inform us, what history is meant, and what it teaches. This being settled, and, of course,

[1] J. Stennett, p. 125-170; Ryland, p. 7.

conceded by us as indubitable truth, it is requisite that those who maintain their cause from the example of the ancient churches, should establish a precise conformity to the model they adduce—else their decisions must be vague and arbitrary. But the difficulty of this kind of argument will be seen from a remark of Augustine, who lived in the fourth century. He says, 'that, in his time, ceremonies were grown 'to such a *number*, that the estate of Christian people was 'in worse case, concerning this matter, than were the Jews; 'and he counselled that such yoke and burden should be 'taken away.'[1] It is further evident, if Mosheim's observation be correct. He tells us that 'there was such a *variety* 'in the ritual of the primitive churches, as to render it very 'difficult to give such an account of the worship, manner, 'and institutions of the ancient Christians, as will agree with 'what was practised in all those countries where the gospel 'flourished.'[2] Add to these testimonies that of Mr. Gibbs, who says, 'we know that the spirit which, *in very early* '*times*, introduced innovation and will-worship, is gratifying to the depraved principles of human nature; and from 'this course has arisen that *mass* of error which has beclouded 'the moral hemisphere of Europe. During the *second* century, a variety of doctrines and ceremonies were introduced 'into the Christian worship by certain of the fathers, who 'claimed a personal acquaintance with the apostles, or with 'those who had been their intimate associates.'[3]

II. But, to prove that our opponents are as much at variance with the ecclesiastical modes of baptism, as with apostolical precedents, we will refer to a few particulars mentioned by Mr. Robinson, their own apologist and historian.

[1] Pref. to the Book of Com. Prayers. [2] Ecc. Hist. Cent. I. pt. 2 c. 4. sec. 4.
[3] P. 254, 326.

He tells us, 'there were no baptistries within the churches 'till the sixth century'[1]—when erected without, they were 'generally dedicated to St. John the Baptist.[2]—They were 'octagon buildings with cupola roofs, resembling the dome 'of a cathedral, adjacent to the church, but no part of it. 'All the middle part of this building was one large hall, 'capable of containing a great multitude of people.—The 'sides were parted off, and divided into rooms, and, in some, 'rooms were added outside, in the fashion of cloisters. In 'the middle of the great hall was an octagon bath, which, 'strictly speaking, was the baptistry, and from which the 'whole building was denominated.[3]—In Tertullian's time, 'the candidates for baptism made a profession of faith twice, '—once in the church, before the congregation, and then 'again when they came to the water.[4]—The *primitive* Chris- 'tians were baptized naked[5]—or had only something wrap- 'round the middle[6]—were rubbed all over with oil, and 'turned their face towards the east.[7]—The men were bap- 'tized apart from the women.[8]—The *Greek* church bap- 'tized by trine immersion, or three dippings[9]—and, after 'the immersion, water was poured on the head.[10]—There 'were catechists to instruct the catechumens previous to 'baptism, and deaconesses to assist in baptizing females.[11] '—The water was blessed and exorcised, and the candi- 'dates abstained from certain kinds of food forty days pre- 'viously.[12]—They also baptized children.[13]—In the *Romish* 'church, the boys were placed on the right hand of the 'presbyter and the girls on the left. In the administration, 'there were crossings, prayers, burning of incense, singings,

[1] Hist. p. 58. [2] P. 59. [3] P. 60. [4] P. 58. [5] P. 60. [6] P. 86. [7] P. 333. [8] P. 60. [9] P. 63. [10] P. 104. See Booth, vol. i. p. 217. [11] P. 64. [12] P. 65. [13] P. 246.

'blessings, torches at midnight, exorcisms, and exorcised 'salt was given to the children.'[1]—The administrator, if a 'pontiff, wore wax or oil-skin drawers and a surplice, and, 'if a deacon, he took off his shoes.[2]'—Much more might be cited of a similar character—but this is enough to maintain our position. Where now, we ask, is the conformity between the practice of the ancients and that of our opponents? Where shall we find such baptistries as those just mentioned? Where shall we hear the double confession of faith common in the time of Tertullian? Who among our brethren are baptized naked? Where is trine immersion practised? When are children baptized by our opponents? When do they exorcise the water and dress in wax or oil-skin drawers?—To reply that, though all these things were mere circumstances and the superstitious devices of the age, yet that dipping was scriptural and apostolic, is a mere subterfuge and begging the question—for why might not that be a mere circumstance as much as pouring, or the confessions, or driving the evil spirit out of the water, or baptizing children, or a treble immersion? Let our brethren establish a perfect agreement between their mode of baptism and that of the early Christians, subsequent to the first century, and we will allow them all the advantage they can fairly derive from antiquity. Till this be done, their reference to the fathers amounts to just nothing at all.

III. If historical evidence may be considered a correct criterion of the scriptural mode of baptism, there can be no just reason for withholding a reliance on its decisions respecting the proper qualifications of the candidates. Now, will our opponents submit the issue of the controversy, about the proper subjects of this rite, to the practice of

[1] P. 77. [2] P. 79.

antiquity? Most assuredly not. When pressed, or, more correctly oppressed, with the testimonies of the fathers in favour of infant baptism, they endeavour to extricate themselves from the difficulty, by assuring us, that they place no dependence whatever on the practice of the post-apostolic churches. The following declarations of several of their best writers will demonstrate their views on this subject: —*Mr. Dore*—'What is not commanded by Christ, or practised by his apostles, is virtually forbidden as will-worship; 'and they who introduce or practise it, do not in this respect, at least, hold the head.'[1]—*Dr. Gale*—'Though I 'have a great respect for the primitive fathers, and all 'learned men, yet their loose expositions and misapplications of scripture, are not to be endured.'[2]—'We should 'have no other rule of faith, or judge of controversies, beside the sacred word of God—for, if once we admit of any 'other, we directly give up our cause, and expose ourselves 'to all the impositions and inconveniences which are the 'inseparable attendants of Popery.'[3]—'If Mr. Wall should 'be able to make out his assertion, that the whole church, 'after the apostles' time, did allow of affusion, we may 'nevertheless think ourselves obliged to understand it as an 'ancient corruption—for error should not be privileged by 'age.'[4]—*Dr. Gill*—'We, who are called Anabaptists, are 'Protestants, and the Bible is our religion, and we reject 'all pretended apostolical tradition, and every thing that 'goes under that name, not found in the Bible, as the rule 'of our faith and practice.'[5]—'There never was such a set 'of impure wretches, under the Christian name, so unsound 'in principle and so bad in practice, as were in the apostles' 'days, and in the ages succeeding, called the *purest* ages

[1] Pref. p. 19. [2] P. 169. [3] P. 189. [4] P. 170. [5] P. 319.

'of Christianity.'[1]—*Dr. Stennett*—'We cannot know any 'thing about the precise nature of positive institutes, their 'true design, the proper subjects of them, or the right mode 'of their administration, further than the scriptures teach.'[2] —The primitive fathers were, it is true, pious men; but 'they were most of them very weak, injudicious, and cre- 'dulous—miserable interpreters of scripture, and very ill in- 'formed as to many transactions before their own times.'[3]— *Mr. Gibbs*—'Can any consistent Dissenter imagine that 'the great Founder of Christianity, who condemned the 'effects of tradition on the minds of the Jews, in turning 'them from the commandments of God, would himself au- 'thorise this method of instruction under the gospel dis- 'pensation, and thus prepare the way for the subversion of 'his own system?—The nature and consequences of tra- 'ditionary instruction, are arguments against its having 'originated with any inspired instructor.'[4]—*Mr. J. Stennett* —'The pouring of the water only on the head of the per- 'son to be baptized, which Mr. Russen affirms to have been 'the practice of some of the primitive martyrs, confessors, 'and goodly bishops after the apostles, is no rule to us, un- 'less we could be sure these good men were infallible.'[5]— Even *Mr. Robinson*, the historian, declares, that 'the fa- 'thers are miserable evidence of the truth of facts, as 'well as incompetent judges of right.'[6]—On these re- marks no comment is necessary—especially after reading the following extract from *Mr. Ivimy's* Appendix to Dr. Gill's Reply, &c.—'Admitting infant baptism to have ex- 'isted, not only in the first century after the apostles, but

[1] P. 337. [2] Part 1, p. 11. [3] Ib. p. 241, 242.
[4] P. 325, 326. See also p. 218. [5] P. 123.
[6] P. 49. See also J. Stennett, p. 97; and Ryland, p. 2, 21.

'in the time of the apostles, unless it could be also demon-
'strated that it was practised by the apostles themselves,
'there could be no evidence produced that it was not a part
'of the "mystery" of Antechrist, which, even then, had
'"began to work," and the influence of which, even in the
'life-time of the Apostle John, had been widely diffused.'[1]
—For our Baptist friends to appeal to history after this is preposterous—and Mr. Robinson's volume, at this rate, is only fit for waste-paper!

IV. But, the assertion that antiquity is in favour of dipping, any more than of sprinkling, is entirely without foundation. The practice of the early ages after the apostles, as far as hitherto developed, stands in direct opposition to this dogma. Any one has only to read Robinson's History of Baptism, and he will presently discover the difficulty the writer labours under, the shifts and contrivances he is obliged to make, and, as pronounced by competent authority, the perversions he sometimes displays, in order to present any thing like a precedent for the practice of his fraternity. In fact, he has indirectly established our view of the case. For, justly considering carved work and pictures of baptism, made at the time, the surest criterion of ancient modes and ceremonies, he has been at considerable pains and expense to procure engravings of several of them—and, what is very remarkable, all the sculpture and paintings of the greatest antiquity, represent the baptized (not as drawn in the frontispiece of his volume—but) as painted in the enamelled window of the Baptist academy, at Bristol, standing up to the knees or middle in water, while the officiating minister pours a little of the element on his head.[2] Let any person impartially peruse Walker's Doctrine of Baptisms,[3] Taylor's

[1] P. 48. [2] Rob. p. 58, 82, 83, 107, 125. [3] P. 74-158.

Letters to a Baptist Deacon,[1] and, the ninth chapter of Wall's History[2]—and he will not hesitate to conclude that dipping was not the only, if ever the ordinary, method adopted by the churches after the first century. The narratives and monuments of antiquity, render it plain that when adults were proselyted to Christianity, if they were immersed at all, they immersed themselves, by walking into the water to a certain depth—after which, the minister approached, and poured water out of his hand, or some kind of vessel, on their heads. This twofold mode is still practised in the Greek and Abyssinian churches[3]—the first, as a preparatory rite, and the second, as baptism itself. The former, indicative of putting off the old man, and the latter, of putting on the new—and answering to the bathing under the law, where the ceremonially unclean washed himself in or with water, and was afterwards affused or sprinkled by the priest, and pronounced sanctified. While we are on this topic, it may not be unimportant to remark, that our opponents have adopted a mode of baptism diverse from all other churches under the sun. This, indeed, is admitted by Mr. Foot, in a passage previously cited. In fact, if Mr. Robinson's history can at all be relied on, and, if the testimony of competent judges may be received, pouring or sprinkling is a part, if not the whole, of baptism throughout the churches of Christendom. Even the Syrian churches, and those of St. Thomas, in Ceylon, and the East Indies, who appear to have lived separate from all other Christians since the days of the apostles, have no other fonts for baptism, than small basons capable of containing about a quart or two of water each.

[1] Lett. 1, p. 48; Lett. 3, p. 76. [2] Vol. ii. p. 295.
[3] Rob. p. 63, 104; Taylor's Lett. 1, p. 19-26.

V. After a careful examination of what the advocates of immersion have adduced from primitive history in support of their system, it appears that they have completely failed in making out a clear and substantial case. The following facts comprehend the substance of their researches:—

I. No clear case of immersion is given us from the Greek and Latin writers, till they mention the immersion of infants. Consequently, our opponents can derive no historical evidence in support of immersion, which is not equally relevant to infant baptism. The citations of Mr. Joseph Stennett and others, from the works ascribed to Barnabas and Hermas,[1] who lived in the first century, are not only defective, but totally invalid—as may be seen by referring to Dr. Mosheim's account of those publications.[2]

II. The advocates of dipping, have given us no authentic proof of immersion baptism having been adopted till about the close of the second century, when, as Mr. Gibbs assures us, 'numerous ceremonies,' of human invention, 'had inundated the church,'[3] till the notion of baptismal regeneration had become pretty general, when fasting preceded the ordinance, which consisted in trine immersion, and was accompanied by the use of sponsors, oil, spittle, crossings, exorcisms, and other rites, since designated Popish.[4] So that our antagonists have no better authority from primitive history for a single dipping, than for these superstitious appendages.

III. They have adduced no Latin work of the second century wherein the word baptize is rendered, *mergo*, *immergo*, *submergo*, *demergo*, or any other which unequivocally means to dip, or plunge under water in the ceremony,

[1] P. 142, 143. [2] Ecc. Hist. Cent. I. pt. 2, c. 2, sec. 21.
[3] P. 215. See p. 325-336. [4] See Gill, p. 331-336.

and as the act of baptism,—in the passages cited, it being generally translated by *tingo*, and sometimes by *lavo* and *abluo*. In their extracts from the Greek authors of this period, we find the original words and phraseology of scripture employed to express this rite—and, when others are used, they are so indefinite as to leave the mode quite indeterminate.

IV. Assuming that our opponents have brought forward all the available evidence from primitive history in favour of their scheme—and that our positions harmonize with the character of their citations, which we believe to be the fact, it may be inquired, what tenable argument can they derive in support of immersion from the post-apostolic generation of believers? To argue, that people were dipped, after the church of Christ was inundated with human inventions, after this very sacrament had confessedly lost its original simplicity, and had become clogged and clouded with numerous superstitious appendages, will go for nothing with any intelligent person—especially with those who declare that 'they reject all pretended apostolical tradi-'tion, and every thing that goes under that name'—who say 'the loose expositions and misapplications of scrip-'ture, by the fathers, are not to be endured'—and who aver that 'they cannot know any thing about the precise na-'ture of positive institutions, their true design, the proper 'subjects of them, or the right mode of their administration, 'further than the scriptures teach.'

VI. Here, perhaps, some man will say, How comes it to pass that so many critics and commentators have held that immersion was the primitive mode of baptism—was common in the post-apostolic ages—and became so prevalent in subsequent periods? That many great and good men of

most denominations have made this concession, it would be disingenuous to deny—though not to the extent and in the unqualified manner our opponents would make us believe. To account for this sentiment, we have only to recur to the early introduction of dipping—the dark ages in which it originated—the veneration in which the authors of it were held by their successors—the uncommon stress laid on tradition—and the credulity of mankind, in considering that divine which has antiquity on its side. One generation has believed its predecessor; the error became ramified as the gospel extended, and took a firmer hold on the minds of the people the longer they cherished it—so that even now many good men believe that to have been practised by the apostles, which evidently did not take place till 'weak, injudicious, and credulous interpretators of scripture' perverted the right ways of the Lord. Nor is the case of immersion alone in this predicament. Other notions are equally prevalent in the Christian world, which had no better origin.—As we remarked before, antiquity equally remote may be pleaded for baptismal regeneration, three orders of officers in the church, and various other things, which are deemed unscriptural by our opponents; though held by as many writers and people as have ever conceded the apostolic mode of baptism to have been only dipping.

VII. Though it is said the usual mode of baptism in after times was by immersion and affusion conjoined, yet there does not appear to have been any uniformity of operation. Comparatively, little is said by the fathers on this subject—but still enough to show that pouring and sprinkling simply, were valid administrations—and, for aught we know, a mere immersion might have occasionally been deemed sufficient. Though we lay just as little stress on the

practice of the ancients in this matter, as our opponents do in another branch of this controversy; yet to meet their assertions, we shall make a few extracts from Walker's Doctrine of Baptisms—a work every way entitled to your consideration and confidence. He tells us that, 'in the first century 'after the apostles, a person sick on his journey, where water 'was not attainable, was baptized by an aspersion of sand; 'and that, though the pastor at Alexandria expressed his 'disapprobation of the element, he sanctioned the mode.—'In the same age, Tertullian speaks of baptism by sprink-'ling as a known and valid method.—In the next century, 'we read of prisoners baptized in a gaol, which, being done 'by stealth, was evidently administered by perfusion.—An-'other person is recorded as having been baptized in his 'bed, which, we presume, was not done by dipping.—St. 'Lawrence baptized several persons with water out of a 'pitcher.—Lactantius calls Christ's baptism a perfusion.—'In the year 313, the council of Neocesarea recognizes 'clinical baptism as valid; though it condemns deferring the 'reception of this sacrament till the season of sickness and 'approaching death.—Athanasius speaks of baptism per-'formed by sprinkling—as does the council of Laodicea in 'the year 364.—So also does Gregory Nazianzen, about '370.—Twenty years after, Aurelius Prudentius calls the 'baptismal element the holy dew.'[1]—In the following centuries, pouring and sprinkling are often mentioned as Christian baptism; and the terms, perfusion and aspersion, are frequently employed to express this Christian ceremony—as a reference to the above authority will sufficiently prove.—Further, Josephus, who was born only four years after our Lord's crucifixion, and who must have been well acquainted

[1] P. 96, 97, 98, 100, 104, 105, 106, 108, 110, 111, 112, 114.

with the customs of the Hebrew Christians, and have seen their ceremonies performed every day, calls John's baptism 'washing and purification.'[1] Now, as a Jew and a priest, he must have understood the manner in which Moses washed and purified the priests, and how the priests washed and purified the people—which was always and only by sprinkling—and in no other sense could he, with any degree of propriety, have employed those terms.—For our opponents to say, the history of the Christian church is exclusively in their favour, and 'that no trace of any other mode [than 'immersion] occurs till the middle of the third century,'[2] is contravening the most palpable evidence—besides exhibiting a great inconsistency, in fleeing from scripture evidence, and resting for support on a rejected foundation.

VIII. Our Baptist brethren have toiled a good deal to ascertain when and why sprinkling was introduced as a substitute for immersion. Several dates have been fixed on, and various reasons assigned for this perplexing mutation. The enquiry, however, is founded on the assumption, that dipping was the original mode; but which ought to have been first satisfactorily established—a task, though frequently and zealously attempted, has not yet been accomplished. It is manifest, from all we know of the temper of former times, and the religious notions of mankind generally, that sprinkling or pouring was not likely to have been substituted for a total immersion. The corruptions of those ages consisted in doing things more largely and ceremoniously than previously instituted among the simple rituals established by Christ or his like-minded disciples. The least acquaintance with primitive manners, places this position in the clearest light. The fathers were for doing things effect-

[1] Ant. b. 18, c. 15, sec. 2. [2] Anderson, p. 33.

ually, with all the parade and significant pomp imaginable —and not for abridging the act or design of any original appointment. With them, as Dr. Campbell justly remarks, 'things always advance from less to greater.'[1]—It is easily perceivable how dipping a person entirely under water once or thrice, with all the concomitant affair of dressing and undressing, blessing the water, applying salt, oil, and spittle, with the exhibition of torches, processions, and the like, so pleasing to semi-barbarous minds, should take precedence or the place of pouring a little on the head—but not how sprinkling should supersede immersion, except in the case of the sickly, the bed-ridden, and the delicate.

When the early fathers, whom our opponents describe as 'weak, injudicious and credulous, miserable interpreters 'of scripture, and incompetent judges of right,' read of 'being *born of water* and *buried with Christ* in baptism,' they thought it necessary to transform this sacrament into something like water bringing forth a saint, and a funeral procession with a subsequent interment, and, to complete the representation, a resurrection to a new and spiritual life. These 'miserable interpreters of scripture,' like the first English Baptists, as Mr. Robinson remarks,[2] misunderstood the import of the texts, and instituted a rite in accordance with their own ignorance. This is one of the most plausible reasons to be assigned for the augmentation of a ceremony originally simple and easy. With them, as remarked before, all was enlargement, ostentatious, and imposing—to abridge or simplify a scripture institution, was not the order of their day, nor in consonance with their notions.—Or, probably, they reasoned in the following manner :—'If the Christian 'purification be a *cleansing*, the more general and complete,

[1] Lecture on Ecc. Hist. Lect. II. [2] P. 550.

'the better—therefore, a total washing, or even the putting 'of the subject under water, must be more complete and 'expressive'[1] than sprinkling, pouring, or shedding it upon the candidate for this ordinance.—Or, finally, the early Christians, perceiving that the purifications of the later Jews was, as our opponents contend, by a total washing or immersion, thought it improper to be outdone in the extent of their lustrations, and were consequently dipped themselves —this would be the case with those especially 'who flocked 'to the church from the polluted embraces of heathenism; 'and thus dipping continued during those ages when, and 'because, externals made nearly the whole of religion; and 'still continues in the Greek church, there is reason to fear, 'from a similar cause.'[2]

Can our opponents point out any other ceremony prevalent in the primitive churches, to which ignorance and superstition did not make many additions—in the performance of which, there was not a great deal more parade and ostentation—and to the design of which, they did not ascribe an unscriptural importance? In this very sacrament, we have the most decided proofs of our position. Our opponents believe, if their practice speak truth, that only one immersion was commanded—whereas, in many of the oriental churches—Mr. Robinson being judge—there were three, with a subsequent pouring. There was, also, the addition of oil, exorcism, consecrating the water, particular vestments, and so forth, almost without end. We have, therefore, no hesitation in saying, that dipping was prefixed to affusion or substituted for it 'in the second and third 'centuries, when a flood of superstitious ceremonies,' then deemed improvements, 'inundated the church;'[3] and that

[1] Antiped. Exam. vol. ii. p. 187. [2] Ib. 188. [3] See Gibbs, p. 215.

aspersion was revived in the western world with the restoration of knowledge and the reformation of religion. Our brethren will establish the contrary, if it be practicable.

IX. The great stress laid on the immersions of the *Greek church*, seems to be founded on the erroneous supposition, that this extensive communion is composed entirely of the descendants of the inhabitants of ancient Greece, using precisely the same language which was current at Athens two thousand years ago.—'What,' says Mr. Pearce, 'seems 'most incontestibly to prove, that, to baptize, means to dip, 'is the practice of the Greek church, whose members, read-'ing the New Testament in the original and their maternal 'tongue, must certainly be better qualified to judge con-'cerning the meaning of a term, than foreigners; and they 'have uniformly, from the apostles' times to this day, prac-'tised baptism by immersion.'[1] This plausible evidence is mere assumption in the first place, and contrary to fact in the second. To say that the Greek church has practised immersion, and immersion only, as performed by our opponents, from the apostles' time to this day, requires proof which the esteemed author has not adduced—indeed, it is contradicted by the Baptist historian; and to contend that the Greek of the New Testament has ever been, and still is, the maternal tongue of, what we denominate, the Greek church, or the language of the nursery, is contrary to truth. As justly might a Baptist contend, that the Romish religion was professed only by the lineal descendants of the ancient Romans, speaking the pure Latin of the Augustan age. The Greek church embraces parts or all the population of the following countries, whose languages are as various as their territories:—'A considerable part of Greece,

[1] P. 17.

'the Grecian Isles, Wallachia, Moldavia, Egypt, Nubia, 'Lybia, Arabia, Mesopotamia, Syria, Cilicia, Palestine, 'the Russian Empire in Europe, great part of Siberia in 'Asia, Astracan, Casan, Georgia, and White Russia in Po-'land.'[1] Even the inhabitants of Greece, properly so called, are, in a great measure, unacquainted with the language of their forefathers, and are obliged to have the original New Testament translated into Modern Greek, before they can understand it.

Speech is ever varying, especially when spoken by several disorganized tribes. In the course of time, most languages are completely metamorphosed. Even from Spencer to Pope, a period of about one hundred and forty years, and, in an established government, a revolution has taken place in our own, which one would have hardly thought possible. 'It is well known,' says Dr. Jenkins, 'that when a language 'is branched out into different dialects, those dialects may 'diversify the signification of words considerably from the 'strict and natural sense of the original.'[2]—'The scripture,' says Dr. Gale, 'is the rule, we know, of our faith and prac-'tice, and was designed for that; but not to be the stand-'ard of speech, which is continually altering, and depends 'upon custom.'[3] Besides, if the practice of the Greek church is to settle this question, and if her ministers may give their opinion, then to baptize consists in three dippings and one pouring—a mode as much at variance with one dipping as with one pouring;[4] and that communion may, with equal propriety, be referred to, in support of our mode, as of that of our opponents.—We say nothing of the subject, as it is notorious, that not only the Greek church, but every other on

[1] Encyclop. Lond. vol. viii. p. 971; Gibbs, p. 86-91. [2] C. R. p. 25.
[3] P. 187. [4] Walker, p. 145.

the face of the globe, except our Baptist brethren, baptizes infants as well as adults.

It is further observable, and relevant to our position, that 'most of the eastern churches, like the Roman, have both 'an ecclesiastical and a vulgar tongue. In that of Abyssinia, 'the Ethiopic is the ecclesiastical, and the Amharic the 'vulgar. In the Syrian churches of Mesopotamia and of 'Malabar, or wherever else there may be Syrian churches, 'the Syriac is the ecclesiastical tongue—while in Mesopo-'tamia, the vulgar is the Arabic; and, in Malabar, it is the 'Malayalim; and, elsewhere, it is the vernacular language 'of the country. Among the Copts in Egypt, the Coptic is 'the church language, but the Arabic that of the people. 'In the Greek church, the ancient Greek is still used in the 'offices, and the Old Testament read in the version of the 'Septuagint, and the New in the original text—while Ro-'maic, or modern Greek, Arabic, or Turkish, is spoken by 'the people. In the Armenian church, the scriptures are 'read in a language but ill understood by the people—and 'this is the case in the Russian church.'[1]—Hence, we gather that the original language of the sacred volume is an unknown tongue to the great body of the people, and is studied and read by the priesthood, as by linguists of the present day—not as their maternal tongue, but as the subject of academic acquisition.

That our opponents lay a paramount stress on the conduct of the eastern churches generally[2]—and of the Greek church in particular—may be further seen by the following remarks of Dr. Cox:—'This is an authority,' says he, 'for 'the meaning of the word baptize, infinitely preferable to 'that of European lexicographers—so that a man, who is

[1] Eighteenth Rep. of the Church Miss. Soc. [2] Pearce, p. 26.

'obliged to trust human testimony, and who baptizes by 'immersion because the Greeks do, understands the Greek 'word exactly as the Greeks themselves understand it; and, 'in this case, the Greeks are unexceptionable guides, and 'their practice is, in this instance, safe ground of action.'[1] —But we have shown before, that the Greeks use trine immersion with a subsequent affusion—that they baptize children, and give them the eucharist[2]—the water is exorcised, and so forth, as previously specified.—Here is, then, 'the 'highest authority in existence—an unquestionable guide— 'and a safe ground of action,' in almost every particular, at variance with the practice of our opponents.—If the Greek church, which, if possible, is more superstitious and corrupt than the Latin, be such a faithful and true witness in this matter, as the learned doctor declares, why do not our opponents dip their candidates three times, and then pour water upon them?[3]—and, as the word *oikos*, rendered house and household in the New Testament, is as much a part of their maternal tongue as the verb *baptizo;* and as the Greeks understand it to include the children of a family —we ask, if this be not equally 'safe ground of action?'

This gentleman, however, might have known, that the avowed, and even current use of the terms in the Bible, is no infallible criterion of the practice adopted even among those who are designated Baptists. Our opponents in England say, that to baptize, is 'always and only to dip the 'whole body,' and yet they do less than is enjoined—as they only dip the upper part of the candidate—and more, as they raise it out of the water, which is not included in the act of dipping.—The German Baptists render the verb to baptize by *tauffen*, to dip—and yet they only pop the head

[1] Cox, p. 53. [2] Booth, v. II. p. 136. [3] Rob. p. 63, 104, 108, 246; Burt, p. 35.

of the person under the water—and the Dutch have translated it *doopen;* and yet the Dutch Baptists only pour water on the person baptized.[1] So that if the practice of the Greek church were in accordance with the views of our brethren, it does not prove that they understand the word in the sense contended for by the Baptists—and might have some other ground of action for immersion.—Let it be also observed, that when a proselyte from Paganism or Mahomedanism, being an adult, is baptized in the Greek church, he is not dipped at all—but, as a gentleman, who had witnessed the ceremony, informed the preacher, he stands in the water, and has a trine affusion from the officiating priest.—He also remarked that, in the Greek church, sprinkling is perfectly valid—as those, who have been baptized in this manner, are never immersed on subsequently entering its communion.—How correct an exemplar of the mode adopted by our brethren!—and what excellent authority do they derive from this ancient establishment!—and what 'safe ground of action!'

But, to use the language of the said divine, with a very slight alteration, we say, 'the eagerness with which our '[Anti] Pedobaptist friends seize upon the most trifling 'circumstance, and press into their service the most recon-'dite and remote signification, which can at any time, or 'in any instance, be found to attach to any phrase or mo-'nosyllable, superinduces the conviction'[2] that they are sadly pushed for solid and fair evidence.

X. The reference to the rubric of the *church of England* is equally unfortunate for our opponents.[3] If the practice of that communion be at all good criteria of the proper admin-

[1] Booth, vol. I. p. 47, 220; Rob. p. 547-550; and Gill, p. 258.
[2] Cox, p. 65. [3] Ryland, Int. p. 12.

istration of this sacrament, then the subjects are infants as well as adults, sponsors are necessary, the sign of the cross is indispensable, and the operation renders the baptized 'a 'member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the 'kingdom of heaven.' Besides, as in the rubric of the Greek church,[1] there is an exception, even in the words of the prayer-book itself, for weak and sickly subjects who are to be sprinkled or affused—a consideration which never enters into the system of our respected opponents. 'By king Ed-'ward's first book, the minister is to dip the child in the 'water thrice—first, dipping the right side—secondly, the 'left—the third time, dipping the face towards the font.'[2] Is not this good authority, and worthy of all acceptation? No, alas! our brethren regard the founders of our episcopal hierarchy, as but half awakened from the slumbers of Popery, as having composed a liturgy loaded with Romish superstition, as being every way incompetent umpires in disputes respecting the revealed will of God, and practically erroneous, even in this rite, as to the mode and subject of baptism.[3] And yet, when the least shadow of support can be obtained from this establishment, 'the eagerness with which 'our friends seize upon it,' and the tenacity with which it is held, are surprising. Does not this manner betray a weakness in fair and solid argument, and a determination, at any rate, to maintain a favourite hypothesis? When our brethren, with so much significance and complacency, point at a few antiquated fonts, in some of our old churches, as striking testimonies in favour of immersion, they seem to forget that none but infants, literally infants, could possibly be dipped in them—and, that when baptism was administered at stated

[1] Dr. Henderson's Biblical Researches in Russia, p. 191.
[2] Encyc. Brit. on Bapt. [3] Gill's Reasons of Dissent, p. 10, Ed. Lon. 1801.

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

times of the year, and that not frequently,[1] such fonts would have been absolutely necessary for affusing or sprinkling the vast numbers brought together to receive this religious sacrament. It is, however, somewhat remarkable, that when a gentleman at Leicester, and a lady in London, requested to be christened by immersion, in tubs, in the episcopal sanctuary, dispensations from the respective bishops were requisite to perform this ceremony. Now, if in the judgment of Mr. Vaughan and Dr. Richards, or of the bishops, dipping, at least adults, were the doctrine of the prayer-book, what need of this prelatical license?[2] It may, also, be proper to meet the arguments of our brethren, respecting the fonts in our churches, by a citation from Maundrell's Travels in Judea, in the year 1697. He says, 'In the 'church, supposed to be erected over the house of St. Mark, 'the Syrians show you a Syriack manuscript of the New 'Testament, in folio, pretended to be eight hundred and 'fifty-two years old, and a *little stone font*, used by the 'apostles themselves in baptising.'[3] Which reference is most to the point, you will easily judge. Let this suffice as a refutation of the evidence derived from the history of the Christian church, in favour of immersion-baptism. We shall now proceed to a branch of this controversy on which our opponents appear to suspend the issue of their cause.

SECTION FOURTH.

THE MEANING OF THE GREEK WORD BAPTIZO.

Our Baptist friends assure us, in the most positive terms, that this word is always and exclusively employed so as to

[1] Ryland, p. 29. [2] Record Newspaper, Jan. 7, 1830.
[3] Fragments to Calmet's Dictionary, No. 136.

support their practice—as a few passages out of multitudes will evince.—*Dr. Gale* says, it signifies 'only to dip or 'plunge'[1]—and that, after having extensively examined the subject, 'he did not remember a passage where all other 'senses are not necessarily excluded besides dipping.'[2]—*Dr. Jenkins* says, 'we maintain that *baptizo* always signifies 'to dip the whole body.'[3]—*Mr. J. Stennett* tells us, that 'the word *baptizo* signifies, and only signifies, to immerse, 'or to wash by immersion'[4]—and that 'to baptize persons 'signifies no more nor less than to plunge or dip them in 'water.'[5]—*Mr. Maclean* assures us, that *baptizo* 'signifies 'properly to dip, plunge, or immerse; and that in distinc- 'tion from every other mode of washing, as well as from 'sprinkling or pouring, which are expressed in the original 'by other words; and no instance has yet been produced, 'either from scripture or any ancient Greek writer, where 'it must necessarily bear another sense.'[6]—*Mr. D'Anvers* says, '*baptizo*, in plain English, is nothing else but to dip, 'plunge, or cover all over.'[7]—*Mr. Gibbs* assures us, that 'the verbs *bapto* and *baptizo* are not generic terms, denoting 'the application of water *in any way;* but that they are *con-* '*fined* to the specific mode, dipping, may be proved by 'a reference to their use in the works of classical Greek 'writers, who certainly understood their own language bet- 'ter than any other in later times—and the Pedobaptist 'cannot cite *one* authority from these writers in defence of 'his explanation of the terms.'[8]—And *Mr. Booth* declares, 'that to immerse, plunge, or dip, is the radical, primary, 'and proper meaning of the word.'[9]—In this specific sense, they contend, it must be invariably understood when em-

[1] P. 177. [2] P. 78. [3] C. R. p. 56. [4] P. 179. [5] P. 180. [6] Works, v. i. p. 109. [7] Treatise, p. 182. [8] P. 50. [9] Vol. ii. p. 69.

ployed to designate the rite under immediate consideration. They also pronounce the import of this term the pith of the whole enquiry.—*Dr. Gill* says, 'those that are baptized, 'are necessarily dipped—for the word baptize signifies al- 'ways to dip, or to wash by dipping.'[1]—*Mr. Anderson* tells us, that 'if we can ascertain the meaning of the term [bap- 'tize] that he employed [in MATT. xxviii. 19] it will help 'us to a certain conclusion.'[2]—*Dr. Gale* says, 'the mean- 'ing of the word *baptizo* must be considered the main branch 'of our dispute.'[3]—And *Mr. Robinson* tells us, that 'whether 'John baptized by pouring on water, or by bathing in water, 'is to be determined chiefly, though not wholly, by ascer- 'taining the precise meaning of the word baptize.'[4]

With this view of the case, our respected opponents have made uncommon efforts to prove that its meaning is exclusively in favour of dipping, and ever stands as an impregnable bulwark of their system. They incessantly refer to the Greek fathers of the church, heathen writers, different translations of the scriptures,[5] lexicons, the concessions of Pedobaptists, reason, analogy, inference, and the like—to make us sensible, that *baptizo* means only to dip, plunge, or immerse the whole body—or, that this is absolutely and unequivocally its radical, primary, or proper meaning. In this sense, of absolute immersion, it appears our opponents have translated the word baptize in their versions of the New Testament into the languages and dialects of the east.[6] If, in this main branch of our dispute, they have failed to establish their point, their cause is hopeless—in fact, is entirely lost—and that they have completely failed, we feel confident of fully convincing you.—Should we be some-

[1] P. 456. [2] P. 6. [3] P. 73, 74. [4] P. 5. [5] Dore's Int. p. 14, 17; Pearce, p. 16; Ryland, p. 8. [6] See Cong. Mag. March, 1830.

what elaborate in our observations on this head, you will pardon the claim on your patience, and lend us your candid and serious attention.—We shall first dispose of Mr. Booth's never-failing phraseology about 'the radical, pri-'mary, and proper meaning' of the word baptize.

I. The terms radical, primary, and proper, as applied to the meaning of words, require a little explication. The *radical* import of a compounded term, embraces its meaning as gathered from its original component parts—hence the word to manufacture means to make a thing by hand. The radical import of a simple term, embraces its meaning when first employed to convey an idea from one man to another. The *primary* import of a word may refer to its original use, as distinguished from its present application—or to its literal sense, instead of its figurative—or to its common use, in opposition to an occasional one. The *proper* meaning of a word may signify, generally, the notion attached to it when first used—or the ordinary sense of it at some subsequent period—or the current import of it at some specific place—or, what is most correct, the idea attached to it by some particular author in a sentence or passage under consideration. Now, to ascertain the radical, primary, and proper meaning of a word, is frequently very difficult; and especially to render these respective properties accordant with each other—since the radical meaning of a word often varies considerably from its proper and current use. For example—the elements of the word to manufacture mean to make a thing by hand; but the current or proper use of this verb is to make something by machinery. The primitive meaning may also differ from the present use of a term:—a villain originally meant 'an inhabitant of a 'village'—now it signifies 'a wicked wretch.'—To ascer-

tain, therefore, the radical and primary meaning of a term is of little importance, unless we also find out its current meaning, and that meaning in the particular book or paragraph we are investigating—which must be determined by the connexion and circumstances in which the word is found.—Consequently, when a writer pronounces this or that specific sense of a word to be its radical, primary, and proper meaning, and labours to build a system of religious ceremonies upon such a specific sense, it behoves him to be very certain that he has really discovered not only this original, principal, and current use of the word, but also the harmony of these respective properties, and the import of it in the chapter and verse of the author on whose dicta he erects his practice. —Mr. Booth, however, assumes that the radical, primary, and proper meanings of the word are precisely the same, as distinguished from some secondary import. However fallacious this notion may appear, we shall argue for the moment on the supposition.

II. Supposing then, what we do not grant, that the radical, primary, and proper meaning of the word baptize, (as distinguished from all secondary and figurative senses,) were to accord, and signified to dip, plunge, or immerse the whole body or thing spoken of; it does not necessarily follow, that the writers of the New Testament have used it in this sense, while describing the rite under consideration. If the word have secondary and subordinate meanings, as Mr. Booth's expressions certainly imply—how will our opponents prove, that the inspired penmen have not employed it in some inferior or figurative sense? As Dr. Williams justly observes—'What Mr. Booth has produced 'from Pedobaptist writers as concessions, no more regards 'the leading point in dispute than, I was going to say, the

'first verse of the first book of Chronicles, "Adam, Sheth, 'Enosh." For the immediate question is not what is the 'radical, primary, and proper meaning of the word baptism, 'in a philological or etymological sense, but whether the 'legal, the ceremonial, or sacramental sense of the word, 'excludes, absolutely excludes, every other idea but im-'mersion? No concession short of this is of any real service 'to our opponent's cause.'[1]—It is well known, that words used in common conversation, or in books, about the ordinary affairs of life, and particularly in the writings of the heathens—whose ideas were widely different respecting morals, religion, and ceremonial worship, from those of holy and inspired penmen—assume a very different caste when brought into the vocabulary of the church.[2] A mere allusion to the words light, angel, virtue, prudence, charity, church, sacrament, and similar terms, will place this doctrine in the clearest aspect. Therefore, to demonstrate even that the radical, primary, and proper meaning of the word baptize is to dip, plunge, or immerse a person or thing entirely, would by no means settle the dispute, unless it was also proved, that the writers of the New Testament, when describing the ceremony in question, employed it in this radical, primary, and proper sense. To ascertain this, devolves on our respected brethren. That this point has not been established by them, we shall presently show you; and that it is impracticable, we are perfectly satisfied.

III. But we take upon us to assert further, that the action of dipping, plunging, or immersing the whole body, is not the primary, radical, and proper meaning of the word baptize—that being an effect produced in the character of

[1] Antip. Exam. vol. ii. p. 5, 6.

[2] See Walker, p. 32; and Dr. Pye Smith's Messiah, vol. ii. p. 399.

wetting, washing, colouring, consecrating, punishing, and so on—whether done by pouring, painting, sprinkling, piercing, or immersing. This irrefragable position our opponents have been driven to admit on many occasions, as will be shown hereafter.—One citation, at present, will serve as a specimen of the whole. Dr. Gale says, 'the word baptize, 'perhaps, does not so necessarily express the action of put-'ting under water, as, in general, a thing being in that con-'dition, no matter how it comes so; whether it was put into 'the water, or the water comes upon it.'[1] But, to illustrate this sentiment, let it be observed, that the word primary, which, on Mr. Booth's principles, comprehends the other two, 'may either signify a priority of *design*, or a priority 'of *execution*—it may refer to the *end* or the *means*. Now, 'what we deny is, that the principal end or design con-'veyed by the word is to immerse.'[2]—The verb is employed, according to our opponents, as will be verified in its place, for bathing, besmearing, colouring, covering, daubing, infecting, imbuing, quenching, soaking, tinging, washing, and the like—and, if their previous assertions be correct, all this must be done by dipping—and which, for the sake of argument, we will admit. But what is the unavoidable result? If the primary *end* or the ultimate *design* of the verb be to dip or immerse, then a person is to be bathed, besmeared, coloured, covered, daubed, infected, imbued, quenched, soaked tinged, or washed, as an act or means for producing the end of dipping. Such is the inevitable consequence of their position, if immersing be the primary design of the word under review. And who does not instantly discover the sophistry of their reasoning? If the primary *means*, or the priority of *execution*, only be to dip, then the point in debate is con-

[1] P. 96. [2] Antip. Exam. vol. ii. p. 29.

ceded at once—since the direct and ultimate import of the word may be something else—unless we are willing to believe that taking up a book is reading it, dipping the pen in ink is writing, going to church is hearing a sermon, and opening the mouth is speaking; because these are primary means for such a design, or are prior in execution to the end intended. In accordance with this reasoning, Dr. Gale tells us, that 'immersion is *before* tinging, for things are 'tinged by it.'[1]—And Mr. Booth says, 'it may be asserted '[even] of our English term *dip*, that it no where signifies 'to immerse, except as a *mode* of, or *in order to* dyeing, 'washing, wetting, or some other purpose.'[2]—One fact is incontrovertible, that whenever the word baptize is employed to express an effect, state, or condition, as bathing, besmearing, &c., which may or might be accomplished by dipping—dipping is only the mode or means of producing it, and not the effect, state, or condition included in the term —and to suppose that a word, which expresses an effect, is to be considered as synonymous with others which merely designate the manner of accomplishing it, is every way improper; and, in the translation of books from one language to another, would produce consequences both erroneous and absurd. If the word in question signifies to bathe, besmear, colour, cover, daub, infect, imbue, quench, soak, tinge, and wash—and if these, or any of them, can be effected without dipping, we have the clearest evidence, that to dip is not its primary meaning; and that it may not be involved in the term even as a means of execution.

IV. Having made the preceding remarks respecting the stress laid on the supposed primary sense of the verb *baptizo*, and shown the impropriety of our opponents' reasoning; we

[1] P. 100. [2] Vol. iii. p. 265.

shall next proceed to establish the variety of its import, in contradiction to their pre-cited assertions. The word *baptizo* is a derivative from *bapto*, and is a diminutive of it. Hence, according to the ordinary construction of the Greek verbs, if *bapto* signify to dip, *baptizo* means to dip less—or if *bapto* signify to pour or sprinkle, *baptizo* means to pour or sprinkle less.[1] Now, the word *bapto* is never used to express the ceremony of Christian baptism,[2] and it is reasonable to suppose this constant use of the diminutive was by design—and therefore not synonymous with its root, *bapto*. Hence we might fairly confine ourselves to the consideration of the derivative verb only—in this case, our labour would have been much less, and our triumph, if possible, more complete. But as our opponents contend that *bapto* and *baptizo* are synonymous,[3] and as they constantly embrace both in their discussions of this rite, we shall, for the sake of argument, and to give them all the advantage they could justly claim, admit, at least for the present, that both words mean precisely the same thing in action, nature, and extent. Now, we contend that these words, so far from signifying one and the same action, in all cases and connexions, have a great variety of meanings. This we shall prove from the unanimous consent of the best lexicographers, the translations of our opponents, the use of them in the Septuagint, Apocrypha, and New Testament—and by such other means as may be available and proper. Should our intention be realized to your satisfaction, the whole fabric of our opponents' exclusive scheme falls to the ground and crumbles into dust.

V. That the word baptize has a variety of significations and is of a generic nature, may be made to appear by an appeal to the best LEXICOGRAPHERS. The following have been con-

[1] Jenkins's Def. p. 113. [2] Wall, vol. iii. p. 81. [3] Gale, p. 76.

sulted:—Hedricus, Leigh, Parkhurst, Schleuzner, Scapula, Stephens and Suidas. Reference has also been made to Montanus' Literal Version of the Apocrypha and New Testament, and of the Hebrew terms rendered baptize by the seventy translators. The result of the research is, that the word is deemed synonymous with the following Latin verbs—to which a translation is appended, and that chiefly taken from the Baptists:—

1 *Abluo*	To wash away	13 *Madefacio*	To wet
2 *Colo*	To colour	14 *Maculo*	To pollute
3 *Demergo*	To dive	15 *Mergo*	To dip
4 *Duco*	To lead	16 *Mundo*	To cleanse
5 *Figo*	To pierce	17 *Obruo*	To overwhelm
6 *Fuco*	To colour	18 *Pereo*	To perish
7 *Haurio*	To draw up	19 *Purgo*	To purge
8 *Imbuo*	To imbue	20 *Rubesco*	To redden
9 *Immergo*	To plunge	21 *Submergo*	To put under
10 *Impleo*	To fill	22 *Terreo*	To affright
11 *Intingo*	To dye	23 *Tingo*	To stain
12 *Lavo*	To wash		

From these unexceptionable testimonies, it is evident that the word has various meanings, and that in general, if not invariably, it expresses the effect produced by an action, rather than the precise action itself. In fact, we might defy our opponents to produce a single lexicographer, of the least authority, who maintains that the word baptize means only one definitive act or end, much less that it means always and only to dip, plunge, or immerse the whole body or thing spoken of, under water or in any other element.—To say that it is sometimes employed in this sense, or that this is its primary import, amounts to nothing in the scale of evidence, as we have previously established.

VI. We proceed now to the translations of our opponents. Considerable pains have been taken by them to enlist the GREEK AUTHORS under their banners, for the purpose of aiding their cause. Five only of their most eminent

and learned divines—Booth, Cox, Gale, Ryland, and Gibbs—notwithstanding their occasional opposition, and that of their brethren, to such a mode of reference, have cited numerous passages from different Greek writers to establish their position, that 'baptize means only to dip or 'plunge, and that they do not remember a passage where 'all other senses are not necessarily excluded.'—They have referred to nearly all the texts in the Septuagint, Apocrypha and New Testament, where the word occurs not in connexion with the sacrament under immediate consideration.—That these gentlemen have not perverted the sense of their authorities to the prejudice of their cause, may be readily supposed—and what is the result? That the word baptize, as employed by the ancient Greek poets, philosophers, historians, and divines, signifies only one and the same definitive action, and that to dip, plunge, or immerse? —Far from it.—The following list of translations presents the fruit of their laborious researches and philological acumen.—According to them it is used for

1 Bathe	15 Infected	29 Quenched
2 Besmear	16 Imbue	30 Redden
3 Caused	17 Immersed	31 Run through
4 Coloured	18 Involved	32 Smeared
5 Covered	19 Laid under	33 Soaked
6 Crushed	20 Let down	34 Sprinkled
7 Daubed	21 Oppressed	35 Stained
8 Dip	22 Overwhelmed	36 Steep
9 Drawing water	23 Over head and ears	37 Sink
10 Drank much	24 Plunged	38 Swallowed up
11 Drowned	25 Pour	39 Thrust
12 Dyed	26 Purify	40 Tinged
13 Fill	27 Put	41 Washed
14 Given up to	28 Put into	42 Wetted [1]

[1] Gale, p. 78, 79, 81, 82, 84, 86, 88, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 119, (comp. Rees 120,) 120, 151; Booth, vol. I. p. 64; Cox, p. 41, 43, 45, 46, 51; Ryland's Appendix, p. 3, 4, 5, 10, 12, 15; Gibbs, p. 52, 53, 54, 55, 68.

Now, let it be put to the judgment of any sensible and unprejudiced person, whether a word which, according to our opponents' own showing, admits of so many different and even opposite explanations, can mean only one simple and specific action, and that to dip, plunge, or immerse in the manner of a modern baptism?—With those who could resist the force of this evidence, we would have no contention.

VII. By a cursory reference to the citations our opponents have made from Greek writings, for the express purpose of supporting their exclusive mode of baptism, we find that (omitting the Septuagint, Apocrypha, and New Testament) the following operations, conditions, or designs, are designated by the word baptize or baptism.

1. Staining a sword with blood or slaughter.
2. Daubing the face with paint.
3. Colouring the cheeks by intoxication.
4. Dyeing a lake with the blood of a frog.
5. Beating a person till red with his own blood.
6. Staining the hand by squeezing a substance.
7. Ornamenting clothes with a print, needle, or brush.
8. Imbuing a person with his thoughts, or justice.
9. Polluting the mind by fornication and sophistry.
10. Poisoning the heart with evil manners.
11. Involving a person in debt and difficulties.
12. Bringing ruin on a city by besieging it.
13. The natural tints of a bird or flower.
14. Plunging a sword into a viper or army.
15. Running a man through with a spear.
16. Sticking the feet of a flea in melted wax.
17. Quenching a flaming torch in water.
18. Seasoning hot iron by dipping it in cold water.
19. Plying the oars and rowing a vessel.
20. Dipping children into a cold bath.
21. Drowning persons in a lake, pond, or sea.
22. Sinking a ship, crew, and persons under water.
23. Sweetening hay with honey.
24. Soaking a herring in brine.
25. Steeping a stone in wine.

26. Immersing one's self up to the middle, breasts, or head.
27. Destroying ships in a harbour by a storm.
28. Filling a cup with honey.
29. Drawing water in a pitcher, or bucket.
30. Popping cupid into a cup of wine.
31. Poisoning arrows and presents like arrows.
32. Washing wool in or with water.
33. Cleansing the body wholly or partially.
34. Tinging the finger with blood.
35. Dipping birds or their bills in a river.
36. A dolphin ducking an ape.
37. The tide overflowing the land.
38. Pouring water on wood and garden plants.
39. Dyeing an article in a vat.
40. Throwing fish into cold water.
41. Dipping weapons of war in blood.
42. Overwhelming a ship with stones.
43. Oppressing or burdening the poor with taxes.
44. Overcome with sleep or calamity.
45. Destroying animals with a land flood.

Little comment is requisite on these allusions. It is clear as the light at noon, that the passages, which our opponents have selected from Greek authors as the best calculated to sustain their cause of exclusive dipping, have completely failed. That, so far from implying one, and only one, definite act, and that the total immersion of a person or thing, they express various and opposite actions, as applying the baptismal element to the object in the shape of painting, pouring, and overwhelming, as well as applying the object to the element in the form of a partial or total dipping.

VIII. But to proceed with this important branch of our discussion. We have no hesitation, then, in affirming, that had the passages cited by our learned opponents been fairly rendered, and the primary and proper design of the word given in all its various connexions, without prejudice or partiality, the renderings would have been still more numerous and opposite—as a reference to the preceding catalogue of its connexions will clearly evince. We shall submit the

subsequent list of English words, as answering to the true import of the Greek verb baptize or the noun baptism, in the citations made by our respected brethren.

1 Bathe	18 Hiding	35 Pushing
2 Besmeared	19 Imbue	36 Quenching
3 Broken	20 Infected	37 Ruined
4 Cleanse	21 Involved	38 Soaks
5 Coloured	22 Lost	39 Sprinkle
6 Cooled	23 Oppress	40 Stain
7 Covered	24 Ornamented	41 Sleep
8 Crushed	25 Overcome	42 Sticks
9 Defiled	26 Overpowered	43 Submersed
10 Destroyed	27 Overwhelmed	44 Sunk
11 Dip	28 Plied	45 Sweetened
12 Disguised	29 Plunged	46 Tempered
13 Drowning	30 Poisoned	47 Variegated
14 Ducking	31 Polluted	48 Wash
15 Dye	32 Popped	49 Wetted
16 Enfeebles	33 Poured	50 Wrecked
17 Fills	34 Put	

Supposing the preceding translations to be correct, and we fearlessly solicit investigation, we may appeal to any judicious and candid umpire, whether a word, which is capable of so many and such various renderings, can be consistently pleaded by our opponents as signifying always and only to dip—and whether the system they have adopted, and which rests, in the main, on such an exclusive construction of the term baptize, must not be destitute of a fair and solid foundation?

IX. But there are other passages in Greek writers, which our brethren have purposely or inadvertently overlooked—and where, in several instances, the sense of the word in question is, if possible, still more adverse to their conclusions.—Dr. Williams, Mr. C. Taylor, and the Rev. G. Ewing, have cited various authors, in order to prove, that the word does not signify always to dip; but that it em-

braces many other modes of action. Without reading the passages at length, we shall, as before, give you their import in a few words.

1. Perfuming the head with precious ointment.
2. Injecting a force into the body.
3. Disguised by drinking too much wine.
4. Adorning the head with dress.
5. Dyeing the hair while on the head.
6. Pouring out broth.
7. Overcome by intemperance.
8. Staining a dog's mouth by eating a shell-fish.
9. Purifying at a small bason.[1]
10. Sprinkling holy water.
11. Overwhelmed by calamity.
12. Tinging the body with various colours.
13. Filling the hand with flowing blood.
14. Embroidering a girdle with flowers.[2]

Enough has now been said respecting the evidence derivable from Greek writers, as to the various meanings of the verb under consideration. And if, as Dr. Cox remarks, 'the 'signification of a Greek term is to be determined by the 'testimony of the best critics and lexicographers, in con- 'nexion with the primitive and current uses by the most 'approved writers in the language;'[3] our opponents cannot support their position—that '*baptizo* means always and only to dip.'

X. The deductions from this branch of our investigation are simple and easy:—1. That the word generally, if not exclusively, expresses an effect produced, rather than any precise mode of accomplishing it.—2. That to dye, stain, or impart a colour or character to a person or thing, is its more ancient and prevailing import.—3. That when the action is discoverable, it is found to be various, up, down,

[1] See Booth, vol. i. p. 92; and vol. iii. p. 250.
[2] Antip. Exam. vol. ii. p. 65; Taylor's Letters, lett. 3, p. 63; Ewing's Essay, p. 44-46, 246-249, 252-255. [3] Cox, p. 35.

forward, backward, and the like.—4. That our opponents have adduced no instance where it is used for the two-fold action of dipping and raising.—5. That the end proposed in the term may be effected by sprinkling or pouring, partial or total immersion, according to the circumstances of the case, and—6. That this point being established, the main support of our opponents' scheme has given way, and the others must speedily follow.

After this development of the various meanings of the word baptize, and which, one would suppose, must have been familiar to the mind of Mr. Booth, one should hardly have expected to read in his work the following sentence: —'Were the leading term of any human law to have ambiguity in it equal to that for which our brethren plead with regard to the word baptism, such law would certainly be considered as betraying either the weakness or wickedness of the legislator; and be condemned as opening a door to perpetual chicane and painful uncertainty. Far be it, then, from us to suppose that our gracious and omniscient Lord should give a law relating to divine worship, and obligatory on the most illiterate of his real disciples, which may be fairly construed to mean this, that, or the other action—a law which is calculated to excite and perpetuate contention among his wisest and sincerest followers—a law, in respect of its triple meaning, that would disgrace a British parliament, as being involved in the dark ambiguity of a pagan oracle.'[1]

But, all this pious parade of language is in direct opposition to the most stubborn and incontrovertible facts—even facts which our opponents have largely and voluntarily adduced—facts which their own mouths have uttered and their own pens have transmitted to posterity.—This para-

[1] Vol. I. p. 84, 85. See also p. 105, 231; and Gibbs, p. 58-61.

graph also proceeds on the principle of counselling the Almighty as to the degree of simplicity which should chracterize his enactments—as if infinite wisdom could not best determine that point. It assumes, what we deny, that God intended dipping, and only dipping, to be the mode of operation which he designed to enforce by the term *baptizo*.—Conjoined with this presumption, is the inconclusive character of the reasoning—since it supposes, that when laws are enacted requiring some effect to be produced, not the least latitude of method is to be allowed in accomplishing it—or that the compliance required regards the minutia of forms as much as the intended results.—Or, to illustrate the absurdity of the position, when a law was made by queen Elizabeth, enjoining that all persons should repair to the parish church once every Lord's day, the parliament determined that the people were only to walk—or only to ride—or only to go through the queen's high-way—or only to wear such a dress—or proceed at such a pace!—Who does not discover the sophistry of Mr. Booth's argument?[1]

XI. We shall now proceed to examine the signification of the term baptize in the Greek translation of the OLD TESTAMENT and in the APOCRYPHA, where it occurs twenty-six times—in four of which passages, the original word is *baptizo*, (2 KINGS v. 14; ISAIAH xxi. 4; JUDITH xii. 7; ECCLUS. xxxiv. 25.) In the other twenty-two, it is simply *bapto*.—This enquiry is of considerable moment, as it will determine the sense in which the Hellenistic Jews understood it, and how it was applied by them in their ceremonial institutions. For it should be noted, that the Septuagint version was made by the Jews themselves about 277 years before the Christian era; and was in use among such of

[1] See Antip. Exam. vol. ii. p. 376-381.

that nation as spoke the Greek language, till, during, and after, the time of our Lord's incarnation. To this translation the writers of the New Testament refer, and from it they frequently make their citations—employing the words of that version to convey a similar sense in their own inspired compositions. And here we are to look for the primitive ecclesiastical sense of the word baptize. And as the Apocryphal books, though uncanonical, and every way unsuitable to be read or circulated as the word of God, 'were 'written by Alexandrian Jews anterior to Christianity, and 'are calculated to elucidate the phraseology of the New 'Testament, they claim the frequent perusal of scholars and 'theological students,' and will assist us in our subsequent enquiries on this subject.[1] Dr. Pye Smith observes, that 'the proper authority for understanding the diction of the 'New Testament, is the Septuagint and Apocrypha, com-'pared with the Hebrew text.'[2]—We feel no hesitation in saying, that the word baptize is here used to express different kinds of action and effect, as sprinkling, pouring, staining, washing, overwhelming, and partial, if not a total, dipping. But it is never employed for one person immersing another, nor for the two-fold action of dipping into water and raising out of it.

Before we come to the chief subject of investigation, it may be proper to premise—

1. That the original Hebrew words, translated into *bapto* or *baptizo*, are five, viz: BAHOTH, BOAH, MACHATS, TSABANG, and TABAL, and respectively mean—to affright—to come—to pierce—to dye—to cleanse.—The first three are thus

[1] See Parkhurst's Preface to his Greek and English Lexicon; Prideaux's Con. vol. iii. p. 60, 73, and Comprehensive Bible, Introd. p. 77.

[2] Messiah, vol. ii. p. 399.

translated once each—the fourth, three times—and the last, sixteen, in the Old Testament.

II. That, in 2 KINGS v. 10, 14, and ECCLUS. xxxiv. 25, *baptizo* and *lavo*, to wash, are used synonymously.

III. That Montanus, in his interlineary translation of the Bible and Apocrypha, has either rendered the Greek word baptize, or the Hebrew terms, of which baptize is deemed a correct version, by the following verbs: *colo—demergo—duco—figo—haurio—immergo—intingo—terreo—tingo.*

IV. That the English version has rendered them by the subjoined words: to affright—to colour—to dip—to draw up—to dye—to plunge—to put—to wash—to wet.

Having made these preliminary remarks, we shall now examine the various places where the word in dispute occurs in the Septuagint and Apocrypha.

XII. The following are all the places where the term in question is found.—These passages we shall, for the sake of brevity, arrange and classify according to their aspect and connexions. The separable prepositions will be modified to meet our views of the verb—for doing which, the most substantial reasons will be given hereafter.

I. In LEVIT. iv. 6—iv. 17—ix. 9—xiv. 16—the priest is commanded to baptize his finger in (or with) blood or oil contained in a bason, or in the palm of his left hand, and to sprinkle the blood, or oil adhering to it, on the altar, tabernacle, or before the Lord. It is evident, that whatever was the action here, the design was to wet the finger, so that some of the element should adhere sufficiently to admit of a subsequent aspersion. Total immersion was not essential nor intended—and, at least, in one instance (xiv. 16) was impracticable. In the second and fourth cited passages, the preposition by which the word is, in a considerable degree,

regulated, is *apo*, which our opponents contend (as will be shown hereafter) signifies *out of*. Consequently the texts, according to their rendering, would read thus:—'And the 'priest shall baptize his finger *out of* some of the blood,' and not into it—'and the priest shall baptize his right 'finger *out of* the oil that is in [the palm of] his left 'hand,' v. 15.—Dipping, therefore, in these cases, is entirely out of the question—and, in the others, is exceedingly doubtful.

II. In EXOD. xii. 22—NUMB. xix. 18—the people are commanded to take a bunch of hyssop and to baptize it in (or with) the blood or water that is in a bason or vessel, and to strike or sprinkle it. Here remarks, similar to the preceding, are appropriate. To saturate the bunch of hyssop with blood or water, is the precise import of the word in this place. The manner of doing it being a matter of no consideration in the mind of the writer. Though the design might be effected by dipping, it could only be partial, as a portion of the hyssop was in the hand of the person, and not brought in contact with the adhering element. In the first passage *apo* is the governing preposition; and, according to the notions of our antagonists, should be read—'Ye 'shall take a bunch of hyssop, and baptize it *out of* the 'blood that is in the bason'—or pour the blood from the bason on the bunch of hyssop.

III. In LEV. xiv. 6—xiv. 51—we read that a living bird, cedar wood, scarlet wool, and a bunch of hyssop, were to be baptized in (or with) the blood of a slain bird. Here you have only to consider, that the bird baptized was as large as the bird killed—and that this, with the cedar wood, scarlet wool, and the bunch of hyssop, were to be baptized in the blood of the slain bird.—Total immersion

was, therefore, impracticable—and, if immersed at all, it could only be very partial, as a part of the things dipped were in the hand of the operator. It does not appear from the narrative, that the blood was mingled with the running water. It should seem, from the latter text, that the bird, wood, wool, and hyssop, were first baptized with blood and then with water.

IV. In LEV. xi. 32, it is said, that a vessel, polluted by any unclean animal falling dead into it, was to be baptized in (or with) water for cleansing it. Now remark that this was a ceremonial purification; and without an explicit injunction, might be performed by sprinkling, as we learn elsewhere.—'And a clean person shall take hyssop, and dip it 'in the water, and sprinkle it upon the tent, and upon all 'the vessels, and upon the persons that were there, and upon 'him that touched a bone, or one slain, or one dead, or a 'grave.' (NUMB. xix. 18.) Observe, also, that raiment, skins, sacks, or vessels of stone, brass, iron, used for any purpose, however large, or however pernicious a saturation with water would have been to it, were to be cleansed in the same manner. Sprinkling would injure none of them—would be convenient for the largest—and would answer every end the Legislator had in view. We therefore say, the vessels were merely rinsed or sprinkled by the proprietor.

V. In DEUT. xxxiii. 24; JOSH. iii. 15; PSALM lxviii. 23; it is said, 'Let him baptize his foot in (or with) oil.'—'The 'feet of the priests were baptized in (or at) the brim of the 'Jordan.'—'That thy foot may be baptized in (or with) 'the blood of thine enemies, and the tongue of thy dogs 'in (or with) the same.' In these expressions it is evident that total immersion was not designed. Asher was to walk

over a fat soil—the priests touched the edge of the water with their feet—and, the blood of David's enemies, was to splash his sandals, and to stain the tongue of his dogs. If there were any thing in the form of an immersion, it was very imperfect, and such as our oppponents would deem very defective for even the feet of their converts.

VI. In RUTH ii. 14; and 1 SAM. xiv. 27; we read of 'baptizing a sop in (or with) vinegar, and the end of a rod 'in (or with) an honeycomb.' Here the action, as we gather from the circumstances of the case, was dipping—but only partial, as the hand held part of the bread, and only the end of the rod touched the honeycomb. But, whatever was the incidental act, the intention was to moisten the bread and to secure a little of the honey. Hence, to wet and take up, are the fair and direct meanings of the term in these connexions. Josephus says, Jonathan 'broke off a piece of 'a honeycomb, and ate part of it.'[1]

VII. In JUDGES v. 30, it is written, 'To Sisera a prey 'of baptized [attire], a prey of baptized [attire] of needle 'work—of baptized [attire] of needle work on both sides.' Here a garment is baptized by the needle—or embroidered by the application of figures in the form of modern tapestry. Here is nothing in the shape of dipping. To say, it was as if it were dipped, would only be a sophistry to overcome a stubborn fact.

VIII. In 2 KINGS v. 14, it is said, 'And Elisha sent a 'message to Naaman, saying, go and wash in (or at) the 'Jordan seven times, (v. 10.) And he baptized himself 'seven times in (or at) the Jordan.' That this great and honourable man, (v. 1,)—this mighty general of the Syrian host, plunged himself from the river's bank seven times

[1] Ant. b. 6, c. 6, sec. 3.

successively, when he was commanded only to wash, and that ceremonially, is exceedingly improbable. From the indications of his temper, recorded in the narrative, he was evidently not disposed to do more than the prophet required; and, that he did not, is plain—for he acted 'according to 'the saying of the man of God,' who commanded him simply to wash.—His disease was only local (v. 11), and only a local application of the water was necessary. How he was baptized we learn from LEV. xiv. 7, 'And he shall sprinkle 'upon him that is to be cleansed from the leprosy, seven 'times, and shall pronounce him clean.' This was the method God had appointed, and we can hardly suppose the prophet would have enjoined any other—at least, not till it is proved.

IX. In 2 KINGS viii. 15, it is written, 'He took a thick cloth 'and baptized it in (or with) water, and spread it on his 'face, so that he died.' Whether the cloth was wetted by dipping it into water, or by pouring water on it, is not certain—to pronounce either positively, would be begging the question. One thing, however, is plain, that the wetting of the cloth was the end intended by the term—the manner of accomplishing it, being an immaterial consideration.

X. In JOB ix. 31, it is said, 'Thou shalt baptize me in 'the ditch, and mine own clothes shall abhor me.' That he was not submersed in the mud, is palpable. He might be rolled in the mire till his clothes were polluted, and that is all intended by the figurative expression of the patriarch.

XI. In ISAIAH xxi. 4, it is said, 'My heart panted: fear- 'fulness baptized me.' This passage is prophetic of Belshazzar's consternation and death, as recorded in DANIEL v. 6, 10.[1] He was overwhelmed with the wrath of heaven. —Lowth renders the passage, 'My heart is bewildered—

[1] Bishop Lowth's Notes in Loc.

'terrors have *scared* me.'—It is worthy of observation, that divine judgments are almost invariably represented by God's pouring out his wrath on the heads of his enemies.—See, for confirmation of this, Ps. lxix. 24; lxxvi. 6—Is. xlii. 25—Jer. x. 25; xiv. 16—Lam. ii. 4—Ezek. vii. 8—Dan. ix. 11, &c. &c.[1]—Hence this baptism was administered by the descent of the element on the object.

xii. In Ezek. xxiii. 14, 15, it is written—'She saw men 'pourtrayed upon the wall, the image of the Chaldeans 'pourtrayed with vermillion, girded with girdles upon their 'heads, exceeding in baptized attire upon their heads.'—Whether these head-dresses were dyed in a vat, or painted with a brush, as people lay on vermillion, or wrought with a needle, as ladies make their caps or embroider garments, as mentioned in Judges v. 30, we cannot determine.—Imparting a colour or character in any of these ways, is evidently the design of the word in this place.

xiii. In Dan. iv. 33; v. 21, it is said—'And his body 'was baptized with the dew of heaven.'—Nebuchadnezzar was not plunged into a reservoir of dew—it distilled gently or copiously upon him—or, in other words, he was wetted, more or less, with this nocturnal rain.—If the action be the thing we are considering, we have it in the clearest manner—and entirely adverse to our opponents' hypothesis and practice.—It is of importance to remark, that there are but two passages in the Septuagint and Apocrypha, out of two-and-twenty, where the word *bapto* is applied to the human body or the whole person—and these both refer to the king of Babylon, who was wetted, or tinged, or baptized with the dew of heaven.

xiv. In Judith xii. 7—and Ecclus. xxxiv. 25—we have

[1] See Keach's Met. p. 123.

an account of a lady's washing herself ceremonially in a camp containing two hundred thousand men, and at a well guarded by the greatest vigilance—and of the purification of a person after touching a corpse, according to the prescriptions of the law. Suffice it to observe here, that the beautiful Judith was not likely to be plunged naked or clothed into a fountain surrounded by so many soldiers, and that an individual defiled, as before mentioned, was cleansed by sprinkling, at least in part, as our opponents allow, and as will be proved in the course of our future observations.

XV. In Ecc. xxxi. 26—'The furnace proveth the edge 'by baptizing.'—Here we gather from the circumstances of the case, that the instrument was dipped in the water to harden it. The intention of the passage, however, is to express the tempering of the tool; the manner of doing it being of no consideration.

XVI. In 2 Macc. i. 21—'Then commanded he them to 'baptize the water and to bring it'—that is, to draw it up out of a well, or receive it from a shoot—for whether the vessel was filled by dipping or by pouring is uncertain.—At any rate, the proper import of the word here, is quite the reverse of immersion—for the water, and not the bucket, was baptized.

XIII. We have now referred you to all the places in the Septuagint and Apocrypha where the word baptize occurs.—A few observations have been made on each to place its import in a proper light.—From what has been said, it is apparent,

1. That the word almost invariably expresses the state in which a person or thing may be—no matter how it comes so—or an effect produced in some way or other—no matter what.

II. That the effects said to be produced are various—wetting, ordinary cleansing, ceremonial purification, dyeing, polluting, overwhelming, hardening iron, and drawing water.

III. That these effects are produced by different modes of action—such as dipping into the element and applying the element to the object with a needle, by sprinkling, distilling upon it as dew, and by pouring.

IV. That the effect in many cases is only intended, becomes apparent from the fact, that it is dubious and undeterminable, without begging the question, what the action really was.—See LEV. xi. 32—2 KINGS viii. 15.

V. That the word is no where used in the Septuagint or Apocrypha for one person dipping another—for an immersion followed by an immediate emersion—and not, without considerable straining, for a total dipping at all.

VI. Upon the whole, it is plain and demonstrated, from the preceding evidence, that the word has various meanings; expressing effects produced by different and even opposite actions—and this is all we are now attempting to establish.

XIV. The general character of the term in debate, may be further developed by remarking that it is synonymous with the Latin verb, *tingo*, and the Hebrew verb, *tabal*. This position is admitted by our opponents. Mr. J. Stennett says, 'that *tingo* and *baptizo* signify the same thing.'[1] And Dr. Cox tells us, that 'in the Septuagint, *bapto* is frequently 'introduced [16 times] as a translation of the Hebrew word '*tabal*.'[2] Dr. Gill says '*tabal* and *bapto* are of the same 'signification.'[3] It is, therefore, only requisite to show that both the Latin and Hebrew words are of a generic character, to prove the assertion frequently made, that *baptizo* is ge-

[1] P. 25. [2] P. 36. [3] P. 223.

neric also.—Passages might easily be cited to establish this point;[1] but, for the sake of brevity, we shall, in imitation of our Baptist brethren, refer to lexicons.

We will begin with TINGO.—This word has a variety of significations; and means, according to—

AINSWORTH, 1 To dye. 2 To colour. 3 To stain. 4 To sprinkle. 5 To imbue. 6 To wash. 7 To paint.

ADAMS, 1 To dip. 2 To immerse. 3 To moisten. 4 To tinge. 5 To stain. 6 To sprinkle. 7 To imbue. 8 To colour. 9 To dye. 10 To paint.

HOLYOKE, 1 To dye. 2 To colour. 3 To dip in colour. 4 To sprinkle. 5 To imbue. 6 To wash.

FACCIOLATUS, 1 To dip. 2 To immerse in any liquid. 3 To wet. 4 To moisten. 5 To bathe. 6 To stain. 7 To dye. 8 To colour. 9 To paint. 10 To tinge. 11 To tincture.

We now come to TABAL, which is also of diversified application; and signifies, according to—

BUXTORF, 1 To tinge. 2 To intinge. 3 To plunge. 4 To immerse. 5 To infect.

CASTELL, 1 To tinge. 2 To intinge. 3 To dive. 4 To dip. 5 To baptize.

LEIGH, 1 To tinge. 2 To intinge. 3 To merge. 4 To immerge. 5 To plunge for the sake of tinging or washing.

PARKHURST, 1 To dip. 2 To immerge. 3 To plunge. 4 To tinge. 5 To dye.

STOCKIUS, 1 To tinge. 2 To intinge. 3 To immerse. 4 To dip. 5 To baptize.

From this brief statement of definitions, it is palpable, that if *baptizo* is synonymous with *tingo* and *tabal*, its import must be of a very general nature, and such as precludes the possibility of our opponents mantaining their practice on the assumption that it signifies always and only to dip; —especially such a dipping as is performed by them, in what they call their pure apostolical baptism. Here it may

[1] Antip. Exam. vol. ii. p. 31.

be a propos to remark, also, that the preceding references to the arrangement of definitions in the before-named Hebrew and Latin lexicons, corroborate an assertion made in our introduction, that the primary import of a term cannot always be ascertained from the arrangement of words in a dictionary—seeing, in the case before us, Ainsworth and Holyoke vary from Facciolatus and Adams—and Buxtorf, Castell, Leigh, and Stockius, from Parkhurst.

XV. We come now to notice the import of this word in the NEW TESTAMENT, on the precise nature of which, we are told, hinges in a great measure the whole of this controversy. The words baptize, baptism, and baptizer, occur about one hundred and twenty-four times in the New Testament.—The original term is *bapto* in the following texts: —LUKE xvi. 24—JOHN xiii. 26—REV. xix. 13—in all the others it is *baptizo*.—In most cases it is not translated at all —when it is, the authors of our version have rendered it to 'dip or wash.'—The following places are all in which it is anglicised: MATT. xxvi. 23—MARK vii. 4, 8; xiv. 20—LUKE xi. 38; xvi. 24—JOHN xiii. 26—HEB. ix. 10—REV. xix. 13.—In these and the subjoined passages, the immediate allusion is not to the initiatory rite of scripture or Christian baptism: MATT. xx. 22, 23—MARK x. 38, 39—LUKE xii. 51—1 COR. x. 2.—Consequently the use of the word in these passages becomes a legitimate subject of enquiry—as, by ascertaining this, a light will be thrown over the object we are professedly examining.—We shall, as before, classify the texts according to their connexion and aspect, and see if their applications are not various and opposite—the proof of which being the end we have immediately in view, as an evidence that the exclusive interpretation of our opponents is without foundation.

1. The word baptize is employed to express affliction in the following places: Matt. xx. 22, 23—Mark x. 38, 39—Luke xii. 50—'Are ye able to drink of the cup that I 'shall drink of, and to be baptized with the baptism that I 'am baptized with, &c? I have a baptism to be baptized with; 'and how am I straitened till it be accomplished!' Here we may observe that affliction and misery are the principal meanings of the word in question, and not any specific manner of its infliction. The cup or its contents,[1] which were to be drank, and baptism, are evidently used synonymously, to represent distress.—(Compare Ps. xi. 6; lxxv. 8—Is. li. 17, 22—Zech. xii. 2—Matt. xxvi. 39—Rev. xvi. 19, &c.)[2]—The almost invariable mode of expression in the Old Testament, and the exclusive one in the New, in reference to punishment from God on account of sin, represent it as being poured out upon the guilty;[3] and, like every good and perfect gift, as coming down from heaven. (See Ps. lxix. 24; lxxix. 6—Jer. x. 25—Ezek. vii. 8; xxi. 31—Hos. v. 10—Rev. xiv. 10; xvi. 1, 2, &c.)—Lastly, the penal sufferings of our Lord were not in the shape of dipping or drowning, but of a crucifixion, in which he was baptized with his own blood, streaming from his sacred wounds and dyeing his immaculate body. Here the mode is pouring or applying the element to the object.

11. In Matt. xxvi. 23—Mark xiv. 20—Luke xvi. 24—John xiii. 26—are the following expressions:—'He 'that baptizeth his hand with me in the dish.—One of the 'twelve that baptizeth with me in the dish.—Send Lazarus, 'that he may baptize the tip of his finger in (or with) water, 'and cool my tongue.—He it is to whom I shall give the 'sop when I have baptized it; and when he had baptized

[1] Keach, Met. p. 16. [2] Ib. p. 71, 175. [3] Ib. p. 58.

'the sop, he gave it to Judas Iscariot.'—In these citations, we have baptizing in a dish—baptizing the hand in a dish and baptizing the sop—meaning, also, in the dish.—The other passage is baptizing the top of the finger in water indefinitely.—In three of the above passages the word is *embapto;* and, in the other, the force of the like inseparable preposition may be fairly supplied—leaving the precise sense of the simple verb *bapto* indeterminate.—Here we remark, 1. That even this compounded word is employed for a partial dipping only—since all the body was not in the dish—nor all the hand—nor, in fact, all the sop.—2. That the moistening of the bread and wetting of the finger are the ultimate intentions of the several expressions, and not the precise mode of doing it; and—3. That the smallest species of action is here designated baptism. Therefore, when Mr. Fuller says, 'in all the applications of the term in the New 'Testament, I believe it will be found to contain the idea 'of plenitude or abundance'[1]—he must have overlooked the preceding passages, especially that respecting the tip of the finger.

III. In MARK vii. 4, 8—LUKE xi. 38—HEB. vi. 2; ix. 10—it is written—'And when they come from the market, 'except they baptize, they eat not.—The baptizing of cups 'and pots, brazen vessels and tables, or couches.—The 'baptizing of cups and pots.—The Pharisee marvelled that 'he had not baptized before dinner.—The doctrine of bap-'tisms.—Who stood in meats and drinks and divers bap-'tisms.'—As these passages will be particularly considered hereafter, but few remarks are requisite here.—1. That they all refer exclusively to ceremonial purifications. The only one which could be considered otherwise, is LUKE xi.

[1] Ryland, Appendix, p. 20.

38.—But, as we cannot suppose that our Lord would sit down to meat with natural dirt on his person, we must infer this to be of a similar description.—2. That the modes of Jewish purifications were diverse, as a person bathing or washing himself and his apparel, and the priest or a clean person pouring or sprinkling the cleansing element on him; which last was the only act analagous to a Jewish baptism, as will be proved hereafter.—3. That we cannot suppose, notwithstanding all our opponents have advanced, that the Pharisees and all the Jews plunged themselves entirely under water every time they came from the market with a pennyworth of vegetables, nor dipped their tables or couches absolutely under water, in order ceremonially to purify them.—4. That washing their hands is called washing themselves—and that *nipto* is synonymous with *baptizo*. In all these passages, the direct import of the word is to cleanse—the manner of effecting it being accidental and unimportant.

4. In 1 Cor. x. 2—Rev. xix. 13—'And were all bap-'tized into Moses in the cloud and in the sea.—And he was 'clothed with a vesture baptized in (or with) blood.'—Let it be briefly noted, that the Israelites were not literally plunged into Moses nor into the sea—for they passed through on dry land, (Ex. xiv. 22, 29;) and, if baptized with water at all, it must have been by the clouds, which poured out rain upon them, (Ps. lxxvii. 16-20;) and the Son of God had not his vesture dyed in a vat of blood, but it was splashed with the streaming gore of his expiring victims. This text may be illustrated by Is. lxiii. 2, 3—'Their blood shall be sprinkled upon my garments, and I 'will stain all my raiment.'

From this concise exposition of these passages—most of

which will be more fully discussed in the sequel, it is manifest that the word baptize is employed in the New Testament for partial dipping, overwhelming, washing, colouring, pouring, and sprinkling—to establish which is the only thing we are here attempting.

XVI. We shall now proceed to notice several MISCELLANEOUS PROOFS of the equity of our position. The best way to ascertain the varied use of this word in the New Testament is, in imitation of our respected opponents,[1] to translate it in different places by one and the same word.—And as our brethren have frequently rendered it to plunge, and have often designated their baptism plunging—and as this term is not much hackneyed, and conveys a precise and definite idea to the mind, we shall translate it in a few places by the verb to plunge.—This method will answer two purposes—it will attest the different acceptations of the disputed word, and show that the act of dipping or plunging is incompatible with its force in almost every place and connexion.

Matt. iii. 1. 'In those days came John the *Plunger*, preaching in the wilderness.'

7. 'Many of the Pharisees and Sadducees came to his *plunging*.'

11. 'I indeed *plunge* you with [or into] water. He shall *plunge* you with [or into] the Holy Ghost, and with [or into] fire.'

xx. 22. 'Are ye able to be *plunged* with the *plunging* that I am *plunged* with.'

xxvi. 23. 'He that *plungeth* with me in the dish.'

xxviii. 19. 'Teach all nations, *plunging* them in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.'

Mark i. 4. 'John did *plunge* in the wilderness, and preach the *plunging* of repentance.'

[1] Booth, vol. i. p. 87-90; vol. iii. p. 314, 315; Birt's Strictures, p. 47, 48, 51, 52; Gibbs, p. 70, 71.

Mark vii. 4. 'When they come from the market, they eat not, except they *plunge*.'

'The *plunging* of cups and pots, brazen vessels and tables.'

xvi. 16. 'He that believeth and is *plunged*, shall be saved.'

Luke iii. 3. 'Preaching the *plunging* of repentance for the remission of sins.'

vii. 29. 'And all the people justified God, being *plunged* with the *plunging* of John.'

xi. 38. 'When the Pharisee saw it, he marvelled that he was not *plunged* before dinner.'

xvi. 24. 'Send Lazarus, that he may *plunge* the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue.'

John i. 31. 'Therefore I came *plunging* with [or into] water.'

iv. 1. 'Jesus made and *plunged* more disciples than John.'

x. 40. 'He went again beyond Jordan, where John at first *plunged*, and there abode.'

xiii. 26. 'He it is to whom I shall give the sop, when I have *plunged* it.'

Acts i. 5. 'John *plunged* with [or into] water; but ye shall be *plunged* with [or into] the Holy Ghost.'

viii. 12. 'And they were *plunged*, both men and women.'

xvi. 15. 'Lydia, when she was *plunged*, and her household.'

xix. 3. 'Unto what, then, were ye *plunged?* and they said unto John's *plunging*.'

Rom. vi. 3. 'As many as were *plunged* into Jesus Christ, were *plunged* into his death.'

4. 'We are buried with him by *plunging* into death.'

1 Cor. x. 2. 'And were all *plunged* into Moses in the cloud and in the sea.'

xii. 13. 'And by one spirit were all *plunged* into one body.'

Heb. ix. 10. 'Who stood in meats and drinks and divers *plungings*.'

Rev. xix. 13. 'And he was clothed with a vesture *plunged* in blood.'

It must instantly strike the most superficial observer, on hearing the preceding texts and renderings—1. That the notion of dipping, plunging, or immersing, in all of them, is inconsistent with propriety—and, in some, makes absolute nonsense.—2. That the radical, primary, and proper meaning of the term, is some effect produced in the form of sanctifying, wetting, cleansing, and colouring—and not

the mode of its accomplishment.—3. That no word, but one of a generic nature, is adequate to express the ultimate and full design of the verb *baptizo* in connexion with Christian baptism—as purifying, consecrating, initiating, or the like.—4. That it cannot be inferred, without begging the question, that it is ever expressive of a total immersion—of one person dipping another—or of the two-fold action—sinking and raising.—5. That the position of our opponents, respecting its meaning 'always and only to dip,' is unfounded—as we have demonstrated in our preceding remarks.—6. That if the sense of this word be the main branch of our dispute—as we are told—the cause of our brethren stands on a very defective foundation.

XVII. What our opponents say, respecting the supposed more suitable use of the words *cheo* and *rhantizo*, had pouring and sprinkling been the modes intended by our Lord, amounts to mere nothing.[1] For, had these verbs been employed, our good friends would probably have ransacked Greek authors, and discovered that, in a figurative or metaphorical sense, they meant to wet all over—and would have pronounced the action overwhelming, bathing, or washing—nor would that inconsistency have been greater than we find in their reasonings and declarations under present circumstances—as what we have adduced, and shall yet bring forward—must convince you. It is palpable beyond mistake, that the word baptize is employed to express effects produced by pouring and sprinkling—or, in more general terms, for applying the element to the object. Hence it answers our end as effectually as *cheo* and *rhantizo*. Besides, might not our opponents be asked in return—if the sacred writers understood baptism to mean a total dipping,

[1] Booth, vol. i. p. 91, 140; vol. iii. p. 247; Cox, p. 47.

why did they not employ words to express it unequivocally declarative of such a state or operation? Had *buthizo*, *duno*, *dupto*, *epikluzo*, *pluno*, or *pontizo*, been used, we might have considered the objections of our brethren more specious and tenable—and, when they have fairly answered our question, which completely neutralizes their's, we shall consider that proposed by them, of sufficient importance to require a little attention—and not before.

XVIII. Here we will cite a paragraph from a learned divine, tending, indirectly, to corroborate our sense of the rite in dispute.—'Although the word baptize, which is a 'Greek word, occurs in the original text of the New Testa- 'ment, it is not the word which must have been originally 'applied to the ordinance, which we are now to consider. 'The language spoken in Judea, at the time of our Saviour's 'incarnation, was called Hebrew, and was, in fact, a mixed 'dialect of Syriac and Chaldee. The Syriac translation of 'the New Testament, is generally allowed to be the most 'ancient, which is extant, and is supposed to have been 'made in the first century. In this translation, all the words 'used for baptizing, baptism, and baptist, are taken from 'the Hebrew word TOMAD, which signifies, "to stand, con- 'tinue, subsist—to cause or make to stand—to support as 'by a pillar—to set or raise up—to place, present, or estab- 'lish," &c. It is the same word, also, which is used for bap- 'tism in the Arabic version. This word is, certainly, worthy 'of particular attention in the present enquiry, because, in 'the Syro-Chaldaic dialect, it was in all probability the very 'word originally used by John the Baptist, as the name of 'the new ordinance which he administered, when he came 'to prepare the way of the Lord—the very word used by 'the messengers from Jerusalem, when they asked his reason

'for dispensing this new ordinance, saying, why baptizest 'thou? the very word used by Jesus when he gave the 'apostolic commission—the very word used by the apostles 'and evangelists, as long, at least, as they preached and 'baptized in Judea, Galilee, and Samaria.'[1] The writer then proceeds to illustrate this term, and supposes that there is a reference to setting up of pillars, as Jacob's, which he anointed (GEN. xxviii. 18), and, as Solomon's, in the porch of the temple (1 KINGS vii. 15-22.) The church is called the pillar and ground of the truth, (1 TIM. iii. 15;) and the saints shall be pillars in the temple of God for ever, (REV. iii. 12.) This allusion would represent the baptized as standing, and being anointed in that position. It also explains the import of the expression, 'arise and be baptized;' (ACTS ix. 18; xxii. 16;) and gives an energy to the passage, 'for God is able to make his servants stand,' (ROM. xiv. 4.) The idea of immersion is entirely excluded by this exposition. Let our opponents impugn this reasoning if they can.

XIX. The position we are advocating will be further confirmed, by examining the various expressions our opponents employ to represent this initiatory sacrament.

I. The baptistry they denominate—

'Blessed pool.' 'Swelling flood.' 'Crystal stream.'
'Sacred wave.' 'Liquid grave.' 'Mystic flood.'
'Holy laver.' 'Watery tomb.' 'Sacred stream.'

II. The element is designated—

'Blood.' 'Tears.' 'Sweat.' 'Water.'

III. The ceremony is pronounced emblamatical of—

'Renovating grace.' 'Cleansing.' 'Passion.' 'Victory.'
'The death, burial, and resurrection of Christ.'
'The dreadful abyss of divine justice.'

[1] Ewing's Essay on Bapt. p. 18, 19.

iv. The action is called—

'Bathing.'	'Interring and raising.'
'Burying and raising.'	'Entombing and raising.'
'Cleansing.'	'Overwhelming.'
'Descending and rising.'	'Plunging.'
'Dipping.'	'Planting.'
'Immersing and raising.'	'Washing.'[1]

It need hardly be observed, that the above nomenclature is almost exclusively modern, and made, no doubt, for the purpose of giving variety and beauty to a scheme otherwise destitute of even nominal charms and attractions. But, as the *action* is the only thing we are professedly investigating, we shall confine our remarks to the terms employed to designate that. Let the question, then, be proposed to our opponents—whether the words and phrases last recited express precisely and exclusively one and the same action? As they certainly do not, this constant use of different and even opposite terms to express one simple and unvarying act, is injudicious, and calculated to mislead the unwary hearer or reader. Let another question be proposed—do all these terms singly exhibit the baptism of our brethren? If this be the case, one would imagine that their modes must be unaccountably diverse from each other—or that the terms must mean exactly the same thing. Now, what we contend is, that the method of our respected friends is precisely and universally simple and the same—and that the words and phrases here used to set it forth, are widely different in meaning. Nor have we any hesitation in saying, that such loose and vague phraseology is employed to blind the eyes of the people, and to baffle the inexperienced disputant, while contending for the various significations of the verb in dispute.

[1] Gale, p. 74, 77; Ryland, p. 6. 26-35; Rippon's Hymns, 442-471; Fellow's Hymns, *passim*; Gibbs, p. 348.

XX. We shall, therefore, briefly examine the various terms used to express the first act of baptism—and prove that they materially differ from each other—and, neither singly nor collectively represent the action of modern immersion, as practised by the Baptists.

Bathing, according to Johnson, means, 'to wash as in a 'bath—to supple or soften by the outward application of 'warm liquors—to wash any thing.' This word does not determine whether the person bathes himself, or is bathed by another—whether the person is applied to the water, or the water to the person—nor whether, if one be dipped, he is pulled out of the bath by another person. It is, therefore, a very inadequate term to express our opponents' baptism.

Burying, means 'to inter—to put into a grave—to inter 'with the rites and ceremonies of sepulchre—to conceal, 'to hide—to place one thing within another.'—This term and modern baptism disagree in two very material points. —In burial, earth is poured on the body, which is not then raised again.—In immersion, water is not poured on the body, and it is immediately raised out of the element.

Cleansing, means 'to free from filth or dirt, by washing 'or rubbing—to purify from guilt—to free from noxious 'humours by purgation—to free from leprosy—to scour '—to rid of all offensive things.'—This word is inadequate to represent the mode of our opponents—as it does not convey the notion of dipping at all—and expresses the idea of purification, by rubbing or scouring—acts not known to modern immersion.

Descending, signifies 'to go downwards—to come from a 'higher place to a lower—to fall—to sink.' This word is defective in three things. As the person descends him-

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

self, and is not carried down by another—it does not determine whether the person descends till wet over his shoes or his head—and it includes no act like an emersion.

DIPPING, means 'to immerge—to put into any liquid—to 'moisten—to wet.' This word does not determine whether any thing dipped is totally or partially immersed—nor does it express the second significant act of baptism, raising again.

ENTOMBING, means 'to put into a tomb—to bury.' This term does not express the idea of lowering the body into a grave—nor does it convey the notion of a resurrection—both of which are essential to represent our opponents' baptism.

IMMERSING, means 'to put under water—to sink—or cover 'deep.' This word, like some of the preceding, is defective, by not proving whether the person immerses himself, or is immersed by another—nor does it intimate that there must be a subsequent emersion. It is observable that Mr. Robinson speaks of 'the head being immersed 'by superfusion,'[1] and Dr. Ryland, 'by descending dew.'[2]

INTERRING, is 'to cover under ground—to bury—to cover '.with earth.' This term, like entombing and burying, is a very incorrect appellation of modern baptism, as, among other discrepancies, it says nothing of an ulterior resurrection—which is significant in the rite of our opponents.

OVERWHELMING, is 'to crush underneath something violent 'and weighty—to overlook gloomily.' This word is the very reverse of dipping—since we are not overwhelmed by lowering our bodies, but by the falling of superincumbent matter, or by too heavy a load on our shoulders.

[1] Hist. p. 108. [2] App. p. 2.

PLANTING, means 'to put into the ground—to set—to culti-'vate—to fix.' Planting a tree, or engrafting a scion, is a very different act from sowing seeds. To plant implies, at most, but a partial immersion, and excludes the idea of emersion.

PLUNGING, means 'to put suddenly under water—to put 'into any state suddenly—to hurry into any distress—to 'force in suddenly.' This word is defective, in not stating whether the person plunged is raised again—nor, in fact, whether there is an entire submersion.

WASHING, is 'to cleanse by ablution—to moisten—to wet, 'as rain washes the flowers, and the sea washes many 'islands—to affect by ablution.' This word does not specify any precise act of cleansing. We wash our feet by dipping—our hands at a pump by pouring—and our face by raising water to it.—'Washing,' says Mr. Maclean, 'is a general word, and includes various modes.'[1] —When Dr. Gill says, 'there is no proper washing but by dipping,'[2] he contradicts the most palpable fact. How is a new-born child washed?—(EZEK. xvi. 4.)—And how was Ahab's chariot washed in the pool in Samaria?—(1 KINGS xxii. 28.)—How did Mary wash the Saviour's feet?—(LUKE vii. 30.)—The same writer gravely tells us, 'there can be no dipping without washing!'[3]—so that we wash our pen whenever we dip it into the ink!

XXI. From this brief exposition of the English terms, employed by our opponents to represent their mode of baptism, we gather that their forms are various—that the words are of one precise import—or that they employ a phraseology calculated to mislead the unwary reader. We have twelve verbs to designate one simple action—neither

[1] Maclean, vol. iii. p. 113. [2] Gill, p. 303. [3] Ibid, p. 223.

of which represents their practice fairly and fully—nor are ten of them confessedly ever used in scripture for baptism —while the other two, burying and washing, are of doubtful disputation, the former, as to its application, and the latter, as to its sense. But they not only talk of 'bathing, burying, &c.' We have, also, 'raising, rising, emerging, ascending, &c.' as included in the verb *baptizo*. Taking out of the water is done by our brethren as a necessary consequence of putting into it. They have, however, produced no authority from all their researches for considering it an inherent part of the verb—which, at most, speaks only of putting into the water, but never conveys the idea of taking out again. One of their writers goes even further, and makes a three-fold action in baptism. He says, it 'consists in im-'mersion into the water, abiding under the water, and a 'resurrection out of the water.'[1] But in what author, sacred or profane, is the word thus employed? They can exhibit no such triple use attached to it in the whole compass of Grecian literature. Nor can our good friends discover in the Bible the word employed for one person dipping another. The only instance they pretend to have found, even in heathen writings, is the following, which Dr. Cox pronounces a decisive evidence in their favour :—'Certain 'Greeks, having enticed Aristobulus into a pool, where, un-'der pretence of play, immersing or putting him under 'water, they did not desist till they had quite suffocated 'him.'[2] Poor Aristobulus was drowned!—a lucid case in favour of our opponents' scheme! A similar instance occurred about twenty years ago on the river Hudson, in America. A minister baptizing a female, and letting her slip out of his hands, she drifted under the ice, was suffocated,

[1] Keach, p. 30. [2] Cox, p. 40.

and seen no more. This is equally decisive evidence in favour of our opponents.

The employment of terms as synonymous, which are in themselves dissimilar, does not arise from their want of penetration—for, when it serves their purpose, they can discriminate as well as ourselves. You have seen that they employ burying and washing as equally expressive of the simple act of baptizing—and yet the last mentioned author says, 'it would be putting Mr. Ewing upon a most perplexing 'search to require him to produce any passage in Hebrew 'or Greek antiquity, where washing means to bury.'[1] They repeatedly assure us, that to baptize means only and always to dip or plunge. And the most laborious investigator of the philology of the question says, 'I do not remember a 'passage where all other senses are not necessarily excluded 'besides dipping.'[2] Consequently the word should express one simple act, namely—to dip. Hence, to talk of bathing, burying, descending, entombing, immersing, interring, overwhelming, planting, plunging, and washing; raising, rising, emerging, ascending, and the like, is superfluous, and calculated only to deceive the inexperienced auditor. Yet another of their writers, more ingenious than Dr. Gale, tells us, 'there is no one word in the English language which 'is an exact counterpart to the Greek word *baptizo*.'[3] But this point, with numerous others of a similar description, we shall leave to our opponents, hoping they will settle it among themselves.

XXII. We, however, have not quite done with this part of our subject. The impropriety of such a diversified designation of their mode of baptism will be further apparent by bringing the terms to the test. This will prove

[1] Cox, p. 60. [2] Gale, p. 78. [3] Rob. p. 6.

that words are employed to represent the rite in question, which are quite incongruous with the notions generally entertained of baptism. Suppose, then, that some Baptist minister, about to have a dozen ladies added to his church by the solemn rite in debate, were to put the following notice into the hand of his clerk :—' You will be pleased to take ' notice, that on Wednesday evening next, at six o'clock, ' the Rev. Mr. Addington will *bathe* Mrs. Button, *bury* Mrs. ' Bennett, *cleanse* Mrs. Cooper, *dip* Mrs. Dore, *descend* ' Mrs. Day, *entomb* Mrs. Edwards, *immerse* Mrs. Ivimy, ' *inter* Mrs. Jones, *overwhelm* Mrs. Orton, *plant* Mrs. ' Popjoy, *plunge* Mrs. Piper, and *wash* Mrs. Waters. The ' attendance of friends, to witness the ceremony, is earnestly ' requested'—would not most of the audience change the forms of their phizzes, and wonder what the good man in the pulpit was about to do ? The following dialogue seems to accord with the occasion :—

A. ' Pray, sir, can you tell me what the minister is going ' to do to the women, next Wednesday ? It is a very odd ' notice.'

B. ' O dear, sir, he is only going to baptize the ladies.'

A. ' Only baptize them ! What is the use of talking about ' burying, bathing, cleansing, washing, &c.'

B. ' Why, perhaps, you may not know it—but these ' words are all one in the Greek.'

A. ' Pugh ! nonsense ! Why not simply say baptize ' them ? What a foolish parade of terms !'

B. ' Our good minister knows better than we do, and no ' doubt it is all very proper.'

XXIII. We have now gone through all the evidence adduced by our opponents, to maintain their practice from the meaning of the word baptize. The points we have been

labouring to establish, are—1. That this word, which is pronounced 'the main branch of our dispute,' has various applications, and includes actions as opposite to each other as pouring, sprinkling, and overwhelming, are to sinking, plunging, and drowning.—2. That the primary import of the word, is not the act of dipping, or immersing, but the effect of some action, such as giving a colour, distressing, wetting, destroying, consecrating, purifying, and the like; the manner in which this is done being often various and incidental.—3. That if the primary meaning were absolutely to dip or plunge, we have no evidence that the apostles used it in this primary sense, while speaking of Christian baptism.—4. That our opponents have discovered no instance where it is employed for the two-fold operation of dipping and raising—nor a text in the Septuagint, Apocrypha, or New Testament, where it is used for one person dipping another.—5. That they have used many different and opposite terms to represent their own rite—which, while it sanctions our position, shews the weakness of our opponents', when attempting to establish their exclusive scheme from the supposed import of the word in question. And—6. That our brethren cannot maintain their cause, from the sense of this term, and, consequently, not at all.—Some apology may be requisite for dwelling so long on this part of our discourse. For, to use the words of Dr. Gale, 'a 'thing of this nature, and so evident, did not, indeed, need 'to have been so largely treated as it has already been—but 'the *unaccountable tenacity* of our antagonists, have made 'it necessary to be very particular.'[1]

[1] P. 101.

SECTION FIFTH.

THE IMPORT OF FOUR GREEK PREPOSITIONS.

The arguments which our esteemed brethren found on the use of Greek prepositions are really so weak and frivolous, that they hardly merit a reply. Yet, as they are employed with overwhelming effect upon the unskilful and ignorant audience, it will be proper to pay them some little attention. The words alluded to are the following :—APO, EIS, EK, EN. These are used in connexion with the term baptize, and are supposed to determine its sense exclusively in favour of dipping. The subsequent texts are the most material :—

Matt. iii. 6. 'And were all baptized of him *(en) in* Jordan.'
16. 'When he was baptized he went up straightway *(apo) out of* the water.'
Acts viii. 38. 'And they went down both of them *(eis) into* the water.'
39. 'And when they were come up *(ek) out of* the water.'

These passages are cited with a vast deal of triumph by our opponents, as demonstrative proofs that Christ and the Eunuch, and, consequently, all other persons, baptized by John and the apostles, were absolutely plunged 'over head 'and ears' in the water—and that John, while baptizing, actually stood ever so deep in the river or fountain to perform this rite. To prove that these deductions are unwarranted, we shall offer a few observations, to which your serious attention is respectfully solicited.

I. From what has been previously advanced, it appears that our opponents consider the verb baptize alone as signifying to immerse under water, and as warranting an emersion correspondent with the immersion. And yet they interpret the prepositions in question, when conjoined with

the verb baptize, as meaning into and out of additionally—making, in fact, a double dipping and a double raising. According to their notions, the verb means to dip into, and the particle added is also into—so as to place the person or thing under the element. The verb means to raise out of, and the particle out of is also added.[1] This, at least, makes a tautology—especially if both terms are applied to the *action*. Now, either the word baptize alone does not necessarily convey the idea of absolutely putting a person under the water, and of taking him out again, or the prepositions into and out of are useless and cumbersome appendages. To be consistent, our friends must give up this active sense in one or the other—and we presume, that, to be correct, must sacrifice their usual applications of both. That the verb *baptizo* does not of necessity, or through any inherent power, convey the sense of absolute intusposition we have already established—and probably shall find little difficulty in maintaining that the dipping system can acquire no support from the use of the before-mentioned Greek prepositions.

II. After giving these words all the force which our opponents can possibly attach to them, it by no means follows that the persons said to be baptized were totally submersed. John was baptizing in Jordan, (MATT. iii. 6.) in the river of Jordan, (MARK i. 5,) and in Enon, (JOHN iii. 23.) But might he not have been in the water without being under it? And might not his converts have been in the river or fountain without having been absolutely submersed? Is it imagined that John and Philip, who are said to have been in the water, were themselves under water? Might not a person stand in the water, in order to perform some act, such,

[1] Jenkin's Def. p. 120. Dore's Introd. p. 15.

if you please, as pouring some of it on another's head, without going entirely under? And might not this other person stand there to receive this affusion without being completely immersed? Christ is said to have come up out of the water—and Philip and the Eunuch are said to have gone down into the water, and to have come up out of it; but do these declarations vouch for the total submersion of any of them? Is it ungrammatical to say, we went down into the water, and then we came up out of the water, unless we have been 'over head and ears' in the water? When a person 'looseth his ox or his ass from the stall, and leadeth him 'away to watering,' (Luke xiii. 15,) and causeth him to go into the pond or river to drink, doth he submerse him, or put him entirely under water? Our opponents admit that persons may 'go to their necks in water, and yet not be bap-'tized'[1]—that is, be not entirely immersed. So that John and Philip might have been in the water to administer baptism, and Christ and the Eunuch might have stood in it to receive baptism, and after all might not have been more than knee or ancle deep. Hence the hypothesis erected on the passages previously cited is without foundation. It is all surmise and conjecture—and our opponents, who talk so largely about building their scheme on plain precepts or apostolical examples, without the process of inferential argumentation, are here labouring to establish their system on a vague and improbable supposition. It is said, 'the children 'of Israel went into the midst of the sea,' (Ex. xiv. 22,) 'and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the 'sea,' (1 Cor. x. 2,) while they were absolutely on dry land in the channel of the departed waters. The Psalmist says, 'they that go down *into* the sea in ships, and do busi-

[1] Maclean, v. iii. p. 118.

'ness in great waters, (PSALM cvii. 23;) but did they go absolutely under water, and transact their concerns in the bowels of the deep? In 2 KINGS, vi. 4, it is said, 'the sons 'of the prophets came (*eis*) *into* Jordan to cut wood;' but surely they did not go under the water of the river to fell timber.

III. We, however, contend that our Baptist brethren cannot adduce the least substantial evidence that John, our Lord, Philip, or the Eunuch, or any other person mentioned in scripture as baptizing or baptized, went into the water at all—at least they cannot prove it from the before-named prepositions. When it is said John was baptizing in Jordan and in Enon, we have no data for concluding that he was doing any thing beyond baptizing *at* those places, or *with* the waters found there—the word *en*, as we shall presently prove, meaning at, on, or with, as well as in. When our blessed Lord is said to have come up out of the water, the terms assure us of nothing more than that he came up from the edge or brim of the river—the legitimate meaning of the word *apo* being properly from. So when Philip and the Eunuch are said to have gone down into the water, and to have come up out of the water, we can gather nothing more than that they went down to the water, and came up from the water—the prepositions *eis* and *ek* signifying, chiefly, to and from. Should our opponents reply that the sense they give the words in dispute, is their radical, primary, and proper meaning, we might contend, first, that this requires proof, the production of which we earnestly solicit. And, secondly, if it were true, they must demonstrate that the inspired penmen have employed them in the preceding passages in their radical, primary, and proper meaning. This they have not done, and are unable to do.

As they are used in various senses, it would puzzle them to verify the precise import they have attached to them in the places under consideration. In fact, all that they have effected, is boldly asserting the strength of their position—which is effectually neutralized by a flat denial.

IV. As the case now stands, our opponents can derive no advantage to their cause from the terms under review, unless they can establish the assumption that they have each only one simple and definitive meaning throughout the New Testament, and that precisely the same as they attach to them in this controversy. If they cannot establish this, they can do nothing in favour of their exclusive system of immersion. And if we can prove the use of them respectively in different senses, we shall go far in effecting our immediate object, which is to show the invalidity of their arguments in defence of their exclusive practice.

In attempting this, we shall first refer to Schleusner's celebrated Lexicon of the Greek New Testament. In this work we are told that *apo* has twenty distinct senses—*eis*, twenty-six—*ek*, twenty-four—and *en*, thirty-six. Now, had these words one simple and unvarying import each—*apo*, being always and only out of—*eis*, exclusively into—*ek*, nothing more or less than out of—and *en*, absolute intusposition—what must we think of the intolerable puerility of a man who gravely asserts they have so many! We shall next refer you to the authorized version of the scriptures, wherein we learn, from a personal examination, that the translators have rendered them in the New Testament by various English terms or expressions. They have translated *apo* by twenty-four vernacular terms—*eis*, by thirty-six—*ek*, by twenty-three—and *en*, by thirty two. Let us now ask any unprejudiced persons, and particularly our opponents,

who lay such stress on the common translation of the Bible, whether words, capable of so many versions, can be only of one precise and definite meaning each? And whether a communion must not be hard pushed for substantial evidence to support their cause, before they would lay the smallest emphasis upon such weak and dubitable assumptions?—Particularly so, after one of their most respectable writers has acknowledged that '*eis* is sometimes 'used in different senses'—that '*en* is [but] equally decisive'—and, we assume, that *ek* is no more. Having cited several instances involving the preposition *apo*, best adapted to uphold his notions, he subjoins, 'it might be rendered 'from in most of these passages.'[1] Mr. Gibbs remarks, 'that the pepositions *eis* and *ek* do, in some instances, mean '*to* and *from*, no one will deny.'[2]

V. But our argument admits of a still further and more convincing elucidation. We find, from a careful investigation of the point in dispute, that, in our version of the New Testament, the translators have rendered APO, *from*, three hundred and seventy-four times—EIS, *to* or *unto*, five hundred and thirty-eight times—EK, *from*, one hundred and eighty-six times—and, EN, *at*, *on*, or *with*, (i.e. the water,) three hundred and thirteen times. The deduction from these premises is easy and disastrous to our opponents' system. When it is said our Lord came up out of the water, we learn no more than that he came up from the water, *apo* being properly from, and, as Dr. Ryland intimates, might be nearly always thus rendered. When it is said the Deacon and Eunuch went down into the water, we can fairly gather no more than that they went to or unto the water, *eis* being properly translated to or unto—and when it is added, they

[1] Ryland's App. p. 25, 26, 29. [2] P. 78.

came up out of the water, it does not prove any more than that it was from the water's edge—for, if *eis* in this connexion is employed for going to the water, *ek* can only mean coming back from it. And when it is said that John baptized in Jordan and in Enon, we are not obliged to conclude that he did more than stand by the side of the water and apply the element to the people in the form of sprinkling or affusion. Let our opponents prove otherwise, if they can—if not, the admission of our interpretations surrenders the main prop of immersion in the judgment of its more illiterate advocates.

VI. Our position will become still more evident by adopting the practice of our opponents,[1] and by bringing the prepositions to the test—which may be done by translating several passages where they occur with the constructions our Baptist friends put upon them. This will be found, in many cases, to make absolute nonsense. We have tried the experiment in more than a hundred places, and discovered the issue to be perfectly conclusive. All we can do at present is to cite a few texts, involving each preposition, as examples of multitudes more.

I. We shall begin with APO, and render it *out of*.

Matt. iii. 7. 'O generation of vipers! who hath warned you to flee *out of* the wrath to come.'

23. 'Depart *out of* me, ye workers of iniquity.'

xxi. 43. 'The kingdom of heaven shall be taken *out of* you.'

xxvii. 42. 'Let him now come down *out of* the cross.'

Luke i. 38. 'And the angel departed *out of* her.'

ix. 5. 'Shake off the very dust *out of* your feet.'

II. We shall proceed to EIS, and render it *into*.

Matt. iii. 11. 'I baptize you with water *into* repentance.'

[1] Pearce, p. 18; Booth, vol. iii. p. 316; Ryland's App. p. 24; Gibbs, p. 79.

Matt. xii. 18. 'Behold my servant, *into* whom I am well pleased.'

41. 'Because they repented *into* the preaching of Jonah.'

xv. 42. 'I am sent but *into* the lost sheep.'

xviii. 29. 'And his fellow-servant fell down *into* his feet.'

John ix. 7. 'Go, wash *into* the pool of Siloam.'

III. We come to EK, and shall translate it *out of*.

Matt. xii. 33. 'For the tree is known *out of* his fruit.'

xx. 2. 'He agreed with the labourers *out of* a penny a day.'

xxi. 25. 'The baptism of John, whence was it, *out of* heaven or *out of* men?'

John xiii. 14. 'He riseth *out of* supper, and laid aside his garments.'

Acts x. 1. 'A centurion *out of* the band called the Italian band.'

Rev. ix. 21. 'Neither repented they *out of* their murders, nor *out of* their sorceries, nor *out of* their fornications, nor *out of* their thefts.'

IV. We shall conclude with EN, and render it *in*.

Matt. v. 34, 36. 'Swear not at all, neither *in* heaven nor *in* thy head.'

xxii. 40. '*In* these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.'

xxvi. 52. 'They that take the sword shall perish *in* the sword.'

Mark i. 23. 'There was in the synagogue a man *in* an unclean spirit.'

Heb. ix. 25. 'The High Priest entereth into the holy place *in* the blood.'

1 John v. 6. 'He came not *in* water only, but *in* water and blood.'

We need hardly say, that every passage here translated according to our opponents' constructions, makes downright nonsense; and this will appear still more glaring, if you take into the account that by *in* and *into*, they must mean over head and ears; and by *out of*, an ascending from a state of total immersion.

VII. But the versatile character of these prepositions, and the futility of our opponents' assumption, will become still more palpable, by showing that these very prepositions are employed interchangeably, as well as indiscriminately

with others, to be mentioned hereafter. A few examples will sufficiently illustrate our position.

I. APO, which they contend must be absolutely *out of*, is so connected with the verb baptize, as to render submersion impracticable.

Ex. xii. 22. 'And ye shall take a bunch of hyssop and baptize it *(apo) out of* the blood that is in the bason.'

Lev. iv. 17. 'And the priest shall baptize his finger *(apo) out of* the blood and sprinkle it seven times.'

xiv. 16. 'And the priest shall baptize his finger *(apo) out of* the oil that is in his left hand.'

Dan. iv. 33. 'And his body was baptized *(apo) out of* the dew of heaven.' See also chap. v. 21.

Ecclus. xxxi. 26. 'The furnace proves the edge *(apo) out of* the baptizing.'

II. EIS is employed in conjunction with the word baptize where an entire submersion is very improbable.

Lev. xiv. 6. 'As for the living bird, he shall take it, and the cedar wood, and the hyssop, and shall baptize them *(eis) into* [till submersed in] the blood of the bird that was killed.' See v. 51.

Acts viii. 16. 'They were all baptized *(eis) into* [till submersed in] the name of the Lord Jesus.' See chap. xix. 5.

Rom. vi. 3. 'As many as were baptized *(eis) into* [till submersed in] Jesus Christ, were baptized *(eis) into* [till submersed in] his death.'

4. 'We are buried with him by baptism *(eis) into* [till submersed in] death.'

1 Cor. i. 13. 'Or were ye baptized *(eis) into* [till submersed in] the name of Paul?'

15. 'Lest any should say I had baptized *(eis) into* [till submersed in] mine own name.'

x. 2. 'And were all baptized *(eis) into* [till submersed in] Moses.'

III. EIS is used synonymously with APO.

Ex. xii. 22. 'And he shall take a bunch of hyssop and baptize it *(apo) out of* the blood that is in the bason.'

Num. xix. 18. 'And he shall take a bunch of hyssop and baptize it *(eis) into* the water.'

Levit. iv. 6. 'And the priest shall baptize his finger (*eis*) *into* the blood.'

17. 'And the priest shall baptize his finger (*apo*) *out of* some of the blood.'

ix. 9. 'And the sons of Aaron brought the blood unto him, and he baptized his finger (*eis*) *into* the blood.'

xiv. 16. 'And the priest shall baptize his right finger (*apo*) *out of* the oil that is in his left hand.'

IV. EIS is used synonymously with EN.

Deut. xxxiii. 24. 'Let Ashur baptize his foot (*en*) *in* oil.'

Josh. iii. 15. 'And the feet of the priests were baptized (*eis*) *into* the brim of the Jordan.'

Matt. iii. 6. 'And were baptized of him (*en*) *in* Jordan.'

Mark i. 9. 'And were baptized of John (*eis*) *into* Jordan.'

Matt. xxvi. 23. 'He that baptizeth his hand with me (*en*) *in* the dish.'

Mark xiv. 20. 'It is one of the twelve that baptizeth with me (*eis*) *into* the dish.'

V. EIS is used synonymously with EPI.

Matt. xxviii. 19. 'Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them (*eis*) *into* the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.'

Acts ii. 38. 'Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you (*epi*) *upon* the name of the Lord Jesus.'

VI. EN is used synonymously with EPI.

Judith xii. 7. 'Judith went out in the night into the valley of Bethulia, and baptized herself (*epi*) *upon* a fountain of water.'

John i. 25. 'And John was baptizing (*en*) *in* Enon,' [a fountain of water.]

VII. The word baptize is used in connexion with UPER.

1 Cor. xv. 29. 'What shall they do who are baptized (*uper*) *for* the dead? Why are they baptized (*uper*) *for* the dead?'

VIII. In some passages the prepositions are omitted.

Luke iii. 6. 'I baptize you * * water.'

xvi. 24. 'That he may baptize his finger * * water.'

Acts xi. 16. 'John indeed baptized * * water.'

Rev. xix. 13. 'He was clothed in a vesture baptized * * blood.'

VIII. Upon the whole then, and without any additional evidence, it may be safely concluded that the prepositions, on the supposed import of which such uncommon stress is laid by some of our opponents, make not an iota for their cause. For conceding, what no Pedobaptist of judgment ever denied, that the words, in some connexions, fairly convey the meaning which our Baptist brethren contend for—it may be enquired whether they have adduced any adequate evidence to show that such is their force in the texts quoted at the head of this section? We answer, certainly not; and have no hesitation in saying that such evidence is not attainable.

A frivolous remark has been made by a reverend brother with respect to one of these prepositions, which shows that the good man had not fairly studied the merits of this controversy, or had written contrary to his knowledge, in order to make an affecting impression on the minds of his ignorant readers. He says, 'if *eis* does not signify 'into, then entering into heaven is only going to the gate 'of heaven; and entering into hell is only going to the gate 'of hell.'[1] But Pedobaptists never denied that *eis* sometimes signifies *into*. All they contend for is, that the Baptists cannot prove such to be its precise import in Acts viii. 38, and in other passages narrating the act of scripture baptism. This point we have endeavoured to establish—and this, indeed, is conceded by Dr. Ryland, when he says, '*eis* is 'sometimes used in different senses'—so that Mr. Birt's observation amounts to nothing in the argument. In fact, the whole of our position is surrendered to us by two of

[1] Birt's Letters, p. 52, 53. See Butterworth's Con. p. 19.

the cleverest men among the Baptist writers. Dr. Cox tells us, that 'the criticisms of opposing parties on these prepositions are comparatively immaterial, and in whatever 'manner adjusted, they must be deemed insufficient of 'themselves to determine the controversy.'[1] And Mr Robinson says, 'that Abraham's covenant, Greek particles, and 'a thousand more such topics, no more regard the subject, 'than the first verse of the first book of Chronicles, Adam, 'Sheth, Enosh.'[2] Thus much then for the prepositions. That they make nothing for dipping any more than for sprinkling or pouring, must be evident to all who have carefully attended to the preceding remarks.

SECTION SIXTH.

THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE FIRST N. T. BAPTISMS.

By the first New Testament baptisms, we mean those performed by John the Baptist. In connexion with these, there are two circumstances noticed on which our brethren lay no ordinary stress. The one is his baptizing in Jordan, a considerable 'river,' and the other his baptizing in Enon because there was 'much water' in it. The kind of evidence adduced from these circumstances may be comprehended in the following syllogism :—'John could have had no occasion to preach and baptize where there was much water; had he not immersed his converts—but John preached and baptized in Jordan and Enon, where there was much water, therefore his converts were immersed.'[3] This notion and argumentation pervade the whole denomination of our op-

[1] Cox, p. 104. [2] Notes on Claude, vol. ii. p. 423.
[3] See Maclean, vol. iii. p. 119.

ponents—and it is questionable, if the above circumstances are not among the main supports of their cause, especially with the illiterate and unthinking part of its abettors. They consequently demand a distinct consideration. The ensuing remarks, however, will shew the impropriety of laying any stress on the places where John baptized his followers.

I. It cannot escape your notice that this kind of proof is presumptive—and different from the plain example or positive precept which the Baptists require of us in support of our positions. They often declaim against reasoning, analogy, or inference, respecting positive institutions—yet are here employing them all in defence of their practice. They surmise and conjecture that John would not have baptized in these places, containing much water, had he not dipped his converts—but can adduce nothing more. They simply suppose that much water was required for baptism, and could be necessary for no other purpose. Now, when Senacherib invaded the country of Judea, he wanted '*much water*,' (2 Chron. xxxii. 4,) but surely not for baptizing his army; and Christ, who, by his disciples, baptized more people than John, did not deem Jordan or Enon necessary for their performance of this rite; nor does it appear, from the evangelical history, that they ever required much water for doing it. Hence we may gather that much water might be necessary for the use of great multitudes of people who were not to be plunged or washed in it—and that still greater multitudes may be scripturally baptized where there is not, for ought the scriptures tell us, much water for the purpose.

II. It is plain and fully admitted by some of our most respectable and intelligent opponents, that the baptism of John and Christian baptism were materially and essen-

tially different.[1] Hence we read in Acts xix. 3-5, of certain persons who had been baptized by John, being baptized with Christian baptism, about thirty years after, by the apostle Paul. The nature of their respective baptisms varied considerably. John, by birth, was a Jewish priest,[2] (Acts xiii. 25, compare with Luke i. 8,) officiating while the Levitical economy was in all its force and operation,[3] performing a rite preparatory to the coming of Christ in the ministry—admitting to this ceremony persons who were ignorant of the existence of the Holy Ghost, who 'was not given in a way 'peculiar to the gospel dispensation during John's baptism, 'nor till Christ was glorified;'[4] (John vii. 39;) and receiving persons otherwise unfit for Christian baptism—at least, such as our opponents would not presume to immerse. (Matt. iii. 7-11, xi. 7-9.) The apostles of our Lord, subsequent to his resurrection, were Christian ministers, baptizing the people in the name of the Lord Jesus, and admitting to a certain religious fellowship the adults they baptized only on an open or tacit avowal of their belief in the son of God as the true Messiah. Supposing, therefore, that John did actually baptize by immersion, his not being Christian baptism, it does not follow that the apostles of Christ dipped their converts also. We find our opponents repeatedly referring, not to the baptism of John as the institution of their baptism, but to our Lord's commission, delivered after his resurrection and recorded in Matt. xxviii. 19, and Mark xvi. 15, 16. In fact, one of them says, 'these two passages are our only authorities for our bap-'tizing at all.'[5] And another tells us, 'they should ever be

[1] Hall's Essen. Dif. [2] J. Stennett's Misc. Works, vol. ii. p. 286.
[3] Booth, vol. ii. p. 257. [4] Maclean, vol. i. p. 114. [5] Pearce. p. 29.

'considered, respecting the mode and subject, as the rule 'of baptizing.'[1] Therefore, to say that though the qualifications of the candidates and the formulary of the administration differed essentially, the modes were one and the same—is begging the question. Let them prove it if they can, or surrender the supposed evidence derived from the performance of this rite in Jordan and Enon as invalid and inapplicable. But, to save them a world of labour, we will concede this point—and yet expect to prove to your satisfaction that both John and our Lord's followers baptized the people by pouring or sprinkling, or, in general terms, by applying the element to the object. This accords with the description Josephus gives of John's baptism, who says he 'washed or purified the crowds that came about him,'[2] but never intimates that he dipped them into the Jordan or any where else.

III. But let us briefly notice John's baptizing at Jordan. From what has been previously advanced respecting the verb baptize and the prepositions *eis*, *apo*, and *en*, rendered *into*, *out of*, and *in*, no fair evidence can be adduced by our opponents to prove that our Saviour's harbinger dipped the multitudes, that came to him, into this celebrated river. It is impossible for them to maintain, except by bold assertions and begging the question, that John or his candidates for baptism went into the water at all. He baptized 'at,' 'on,' or 'with' the water of this celebrated stream. He probably stood in the channel of the Jordan, and might then be fairly said to be in the river, as the Israelites are said to have gone into the midst of the sea and to have been baptized in the sea, when we know from the narrative of the Exodus that they were only in the channel of the divided and departed

[1] Booth, vol. iii. p. 371. [2] Ant. b. 18, c. 5, s. 2.

waters. It should be also observed that John 'baptized in the wilderness,' commonly a waste, wild, and barren place, (Mark i. 4.) 'In the country about Jordan,' (Luke iii. 3,) 'in Bethabara, beyond Jordan,' (John i. 28,) and in the place where Christ took up his abode, (John x. 40.) Here are four places mentioned as scenes of John's ministry and baptism, where, for ought our opponents know, there was little or no water at all. Even, while in the vicinity of this river, he did not find it necessary to baptize all his people in it. He performed this ceremony in the wilderness, where we should not expect to find a great deal of water; and where Christ took up his abode, which was surely not in a brook, pool, or fountain. This last citation proves that little stress can be laid on the terms 'in Jordan.' For as John baptized only in the neighbourhood or near the place where Christ took up his abode, so he might have baptized on or near the Jordan only. If the words 'in the place' mean only near the place, why should the words 'in the Jordan' mean more than near the Jordan? Let our opponents establish the difference of the expressions. As John's baptizing at Jordan will be a subject of after consideration, we must not enlarge further on it at present—

IV. And therefore shall proceed to his baptizing in Enon, (John iii. 23.) It is said, he was baptizing there because there was much water. Now, you need hardly be informed, that this passage is adduced on the other side with all the *eclat* of a complete victory. Let us then enquire whether our brethren can establish their dipping system from this narrative.

1. Enon, according to Parkhurst, signifies a fountain or spring—according to Schleusner, it is the 'name of a city, situated near the Jordan on the borders of the tribe of

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

'Manasseh, where it joined the tribe of Issachar, near to 'Salim, distant seven miles from Scythopolis. Here John 'baptized (JOHN iii. 23), because there were many waters; 'whence also it received its name—for *Einon*, as *On*, signi-'fies metaphorically a fountain.'[1] And the phrase *hydata polla* means literally many waters or several streams. But we must refer to the remarks of a learned and laborious investigator of this subject on the other side of the debate. Mr. Robinson tells us that 'Enon, near the Jordan, was 'either a natural spring, an artificial reservoir, or a cavern-'ous temple of the sun.'[2] The spring where John baptized 'was called the Dove's Eye. The prophet Nahum (ch. ii. 6) 'describes waters running off in streams gurgling among 'stones, as doves that wander cooing; or, as the English 'version has it, tabouring through the solitary grove. Ac-'cording to this, Enon was a cavernous spring, and such 'were of great account in Judea, especially in some sea-'sons.'[3] Hence Enon was not a place of much water, in the modern and occidental use of those terms; nor contained sufficient for those immersions which it is presumed took place in it. 'It is very probable,' says a convert to Pedo-baptism, in his Scripture Reasons for Infant Baptism,[4] 'that 'Enon was a village or tract of land where there were many 'springs, which terminated in many rivulets of water. It is 'observable that the town called Middin, in JOSH. xv. 61, 'is named Enon by the seventy Greek interpreters of the 'Old Testament. They also observe, that in JUDGES v. 10, 'mention is made of those that sit in, upon, or near 'Middin—we read 'in judgment,' where the Holy Ghost 'takes notice of the places of drawing water, so that if any

[1] Lex. in Loc. [2] Rob. p. 14. [3] Ibid, p. 17.
[4] P. 46, Ed. Birmingham, 1818.

'one would know why Middin is rendered Enon by the 'seventy Greek interpreters of the Old Testament, the thing 'is evident, because of the places of drawing water.'

11. While the words much water, many waters, great waters, and waters, in the plural, in many places, mean large congregations of this element, particularly when used to express figuratively crime or calamity, we find them often employed when what we should consider little water is intended. A few citations will place this in a clear point of light. *Many waters* are used to express the moistening of the soil with rain. 'He shall pour the water out of his 'buckets and his seed shall be in many waters,' (NUMB. xxiv. 7)—for several rills watering a vineyard. 'Thy 'mother is like a vine in thy blood, placed by the waters; 'she was fruitful and full of branches by reason of many 'waters,' (EZEK. xix. 10.) *Great waters* are used to express the streams refreshing and fertilizing the fields and gardens of Judea or elsewhere. 'He took also of the seed 'of the land and planted it in a fruitful field; he placed it 'by great waters and set it as a willow tree,' (EZEK. xvii. 5.) 'This vine did bend her roots towards him and 'shot forth her branches toward him, that he might water 'it by the furrows of her plantations. It was planted in a 'good soil by great waters, that it might bring forth branches 'and that it might bear fruit, that it might be a goodly vine,' (v. 7, 8.) The 'great waters' in Gibeon, (JER. xli. 12,) are called 'the *pool* of Gibeon' in 2 SAM. ii. 13, and by Josephus, 'a certain *fountain* in the city Gibeon.'[1] So that these great waters are only a pool or fountain of water. *Much water* is used for a brook that might be stopped up and for wells that might be covered and hidden. 'So

[1] Ant. b. 7, c. 1, s. 3.

'there was gathered much people together, who stopped 'all the fountains and the brook [or river Kedron] that ran 'through the midst of the land, saying, why should the 'king of Assyria come and find much water?' (2 CHRON. xxxii. 4.) The term *Waters*, in the plural number, is used to express several wells. 'And they came to Elim, where 'there were twelve wells of water and three score and ten 'palm trees, and they encamped there by the waters,' (EXOD. xv. 27)—for a single spring or fountain—'and he 'went forth unto the spring of the waters and cast the salt 'in there and said, thus saith the Lord, I have healed these 'waters: so the waters were healed unto this day,' (2 KINGS ii. 21, 22.) Maundrell visited this well or fountain, about which Josephus expaciates so complacently,[1] and denominates it 'a spring issuing several small streams watering 'a field.'[2] It is used for a cup of water—'waters of a full 'cup are wrung out to them,' (PSALM lxxiii. 10)—for such a quantity as people drink—'drink waters out of thine 'own cistern and running waters out of thine own well,' (PROV. v, 15)—and for tears, 'that our eyes may run down 'with tears and our eyelids gush out with waters, (JER. ix. 18.) The laver of the temple, which contained at most one thousand barrels, is called 'a molten sea,' (1 KINGS vii. 23.)

III. The above passages are adduced as specimens of many more. From this we perceive that many waters, great waters, much water, and waters in the plural, are terms employed to designate what, in this country, would be considered but a little of this element. When we hear our opponents talking of Enon with its much water or many streams as necessarily being little less than 'the confluence

[1] Hist. Wars, b. 4, c. 8, s. 3. [2] Travels.

'of the Tigris or Euphrates, the swelling of the Nile, or as 'echoing to the voice of many thunderings, the sound of a 'cataract, and the roaring of the sea'[1]—astonishment overwhelms us. That the words many waters, great waters, much water, and waters, are sometimes expressive of rivers, lakes, and seas, no one can question—but to say such immense quantities of water are necessarily implied in the terms, Hebrew, Greek, or English, is to betray a cranium certainly less hard than adamant. Let our opponents tell us where these mighty floods are to be found, let them point out some ancient geographer who has described this celebrated sister of the Nile, the Euphrates and the Amazon. The fact is, 'Enon, near to Salim,' as the phraseology implies, was a place of little notoriety, unknown as a village in early times, and unnoticed for its waters, save in the text under review, in the New Testament. Neither does Josephus ever say a word respecting Enon in any of his works, though he describes, or at least notices, almost every other fountain or water of any magnitude in the Holy Land—so insignificant was this roaring cataract in his day, though he was coeval with the apostles. And all that modern travellers have been able to discover as a vestige of its former magnificence, is only a well whither the virgins go forth to draw water for their flocks and their father's families. Dr. Gill justly remarks, 'there is great difficulty in determining where or what this Enon was.'[2]

IV. Let it be observed, also, that John could not have gone from Jordan to Enon or any other place merely for the sake of having 'much water.' He must have had some other motive for his movement. Jordan was a considerable river, and Enon, according to Robinson, a spring in a cave.

[1] Ryland's App. p. 30. [2] P. 206.

This latter place was probably more centrical and convenient for some of the inhabitants of the country—and the water was necessary for the refreshment of his numerous followers in that comparatively arid climate. 'Such a 'spring was of great account in Judea, especially in some 'seasons' of the year, when water was very scarce and the weather very sultry. He that congregated multitudes of people in such a country must, like Senacherib, have required much water; and if they attended John, as they did our Lord, three or four days successively (MATT. xv. 32), the necessity of much water, for other purposes than immersion, must have been great. Thus John prudently took his station where the lives of his followers would not be endangered by the drought, and where the well-watered soil produced shrubs and trees, which proved a cooling shade amidst the scorching heat of a Summer's day in Palestine. Hence Christ often resided, and preached near the sea of Tiberias, Capernaum, and Galilee; though there is not a word spoken of his baptizing in any part of this lake. Now, if there were other cogent reasons for John's baptizing in Enon, where there was much water, besides the operation of dipping his converts, we are at perfect liberty to conclude, that these alone influenced his proceedings. Besides, if this Enon were a fountain or spring in a cave, it, in all probability, supplied the people and their cattle with water to drink, as well as John for his washings or baptisms; and as his followers were numerous, many of them must have been bathed in this fountain previously to the drinking of others, and consequently must have been refreshed with dirty and ceremonially polluted beveridge. Whether this was the case or not, you may easily determine. Such a proceeding would hardly be tolerated in our

times, even by those who are so loud about taking up the cross and sacrificing delicacy to a compliance with duty. You will also remember that pure, fair, running, or living water, derived from perpetual springs, was requisite for purification or baptism; and when so many became the subjects of his ministration, it may easily account for his taking his station at Jordan, Enon, or other places where there was a fountain or stream, great or small, of pure water adapted to his typical ablution or consecration.

V. But it may be argued further, that for the mere purpose of immersing one individual after another, John could could have no valid reason for going either to Jordan or Enon. The former is a deep river, sometimes overflowing its banks (Josh. iii. 15), and, at certain seasons of the year, running with considerable velocity. 'Dr. Shaw com-'puted it about thirty yards broad and three yards in depth, 'and states that it discharged daily into the Dead Sea about '6,090,000 tons of water. Viscount Chateaubriand, who 'travelled nearly a century after him, found the Jordan to 'be six or seven feet deep *close to the shore*, and about 'fifty paces in breadth.'[1] And our brethren suggest, that Enon comported with the confluence of the Tigris and Euphrates, the swelling of the Nile, the voice of many thunderings, the roaring of the sea, and the rushing of a cataract. But could these have been convenient places for dipping either men or women in their light, loose, flowing dresses; or for a man, at most, six feet high, to stand in days and months consecutively, for the purpose of immersing them? Do our apostle-like opponents go in quest of such mighty waters for the purpose of dipping their people, though guarded with cloaks, and sometimes mud-boots,

[1] Horne's Introd. p. 34, Lond. 1825.

and all that the wit of modern ingenuity has contrived against accidents and exposures of the person? Do they not consider a baptistry, artificially constructed, with steps, pump, and sewers, and filled to a definite height with quiescent water, much more convenient in many respects? That such a congregation of this element was unnecessary, we may gather from the declaration of our opponents, who, being practical men, are of course the best judges in this particular. Mr. Robinson says, 'the true depth of water 'for baptizing an individual, is something less than two-'thirds of the height; but the tallest man may be baptized 'in the Lateran depth, which is thirty-seven inches and 'half.'[1] If this be a fact, and we have no reason to question it, how unsuitable was Jordan, a deep rapid river? and Enon, roaring and foaming along, could not have been a whit better. 'In baptism,' says another eminent writer on the same side, 'it is the act of immersion, and not the 'quantity of water, that is contended for—so that there be 'sufficient after a prudent and suitable manner to dip or 'bury the person baptized in it.'[2] A third observes, that 'one single rivulet, having pools of fair and deep water, 'would have been as fit for John's purpose as if he had 'twenty.'[3] Our friends, in accounting for the baptisms of the apostles, without going to natural water-courses, suppose that baths were very numerous in 'private-houses in 'Jerusalem, and bathing common among the Jews;' and no doubt used for this purpose.[4] Conceding the truth of this assumption, it may be remarked, that as John was a great favourite with the public (Matt. xiv. 5; xxi. 26), 'who were ready to do any thing he should advise,'[5] he

[1] P. 73. [2] Jenkin's Def. p. 108. [3] Rees, p. 126.
[4] Gill, p. 460, 215; Booth, v. i. p. 250. [5] Jos. Ant. b. 18, c. 5, s. 2.

might have used these baths also; and surely it would have conduced much to the decent manner of this ceremony, and the feasibility of its performance, over the plunging of men and women into a deep, rapid, and powerful river, or a foaming cataract. But John did not use these baths—his manner of conducting this ceremony could be done with equal facility where there was much water or little—at or on the Jordan or fountain of Enon, or in the wilderness where Christ took up his abode. Consequently he did not baptize near these places for the sake of immersing his followers—some other inducements marked out his course and fixed on his stations.

VI. Upon the whole we conclude, that the great parade of our opponents about John's dipping in Jordan and in Enon, because there was much water in these places, amounts to no more than a feather against a millstone in the scales of rational investigation. Superficial minds may be caught by the sound of words; but persons of judgment will weigh their sense, and determine accordingly: and this has been our object in the present enquiry.

SECTION SEVENTH.

CERTAIN ALLUSIONS TO SCRIPTURE BAPTISM.

Our opponents often refer us, with a good deal of exultation, to various references made by Christ and his disciples, which, in their humble opinion, countenance their method of performing this initiatory rite, as—

The baptism of the Israelites in the Red Sea, (1 Cor. x. 2.)

Of Noah and his family in the ark, (1 Pet. iii. 20, 21.)

The sufferings of Christ and his disciples, (Mat. xx. 22, 23.)
The sufferings of believers in Christ, as their federal representative, (Rom. vi. 5, 6; Col. ii. 10-13.)

These allusions are often brought forward and much dwelt upon by our respected brethren; but they do not produce in our minds any impressions favourable to their mode of baptism. A brief consideration of each will doubtless justify our sentiments. As the first three are not deemed very important, and as the fourth is regarded as an impregnable battlement about their cause, it claims, and shall receive, most of our attention.

I. 'And were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and 'in the sea,' (1 Cor. x. 2.) This text, according to the literal construction of our our opponents in other cases, should be rendered, 'And were all totally dipped *(eis)* 'into Moses in the cloud and in the sea.' The passage says nothing of their being dipped into the cloud and into the sea; but only while passing behind, under, and before the one, and between the waters of the other, they were baptized into Moses. But not to be too literal with our brethren, and to allow them advantages they have no right to claim, let us enquire if these Hebrews were dipped into the cloud or the sea in their transit from Egypt to the wilderness of Shur? Mr. Booth assures us, that 'the word bap-'tize, in this dispute, denotes an *action* required by divine 'law, and the simple question is, what is that action?'[1] We reply certainly not dipping in the case before us; for the sacred historian assures us, that they all went through the channel of the departed waters upon dry land, (Ex. xiv. 22.) What was the action here?—walking between the divided flood. To retort, that the clouds were over their heads,

[1] Vol. iii. p. 265.

and the heaps of water on each side of them, whereby they were as if immersed, has nothing to do with the matter in debate, which is about the action embraced by the verb and displayed by the event. The Baptists contend for dipping a person really and absolutely under water, in order to constitute a proper baptism, and ridicule the notion of any less or otherwise being baptism at all. If water-baptism were at all intended, it was effected by a shower. 'The 'clouds poured out water' (Ps. lxxvii. 17); and in this way they were baptized, like Nebuchadnezzar, with a copious sprinkling from above. The refuge of our friends in the supposed saturated state of the Hebrews, is a mere conjecture and a sophism—a conjecture, as they do not know that even the rain fell on the chosen tribes—and a mere sophism, since a person walking in the rain till wet to the skin would not, according to their notions, be properly baptized. On this principle, a copious shower-bath would be equally efficient with an artificial or natural baptistry. This would however be giving up the action in which the essence of the sacrament is said to consist. At all events, this allusion will not support the exclusive system of immersion.

II. 'Which sometime were disobedient, when once the 'long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while 'the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls, 'were saved by water. The like figure, whereunto baptism 'doth now save us (not the putting away the filth of the 'flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God), 'by the resurrection of Jesus Christ,' (1 Pet. iii. 20, 21.) Now, if this text refer to any mode of water-baptism at all, and not to the influence of the Holy Ghost, it must be to the baptism of the ark, or of Noah and his family in it, or of both conjoined. Suppose it were of the ark, then what

was the action here? Was the vessel absolutely dipped under water, or did the water descend upon it? Unquestionably the latter; and though, from the quantity of rain which fell, the vessel was at length partly in the water and partly out of the water, it was never dipped, nor ever entirely under the rising element. The baptism of the ark was much like some of the representations in Mr. Robinson's plates of ancient Christian baptism; where the converts are seen standing up to the knees or middle in water, while the officiating minister pours some of it on their heads.—Suppose it were Noah and his family in the ark, then they were baptized with a 'dry baptism;' for the water from above or below never touched them. The rain fell in torrents on the roof of their vessel, but they were not brought in contact with it. And if this were baptism, we are often baptized by our fire-sides, while a copious shower is falling on the tiles of our habitations; and the mariner in his cabin at sea is being constantly baptized when it rains on the deck of his ship, though not a drop of it reaches his person. At any rate, Noah and his family were not plunged, immersed, or dipped, in the waters of the deluge; and what may be said of the ark and the people separately, may be pronounced of both conjointly. To say that the Hebrews and Noah were, as it were baptized, only betrays the difficulties felt by our opponents in this case. If in this or the preceding instance there was a baptism analagous to their method, the Egyptians were the only subjects in the former case, and those who were shut out of the ark, in the latter; and who, as stated in the Baptist Magazine, were 'baptized to a general destruction.'[1]

III. 'Are ye able to drink of the cup that I shall drink

[1] Bapt. Mag. for 1816, p. 198.

'of, and to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized 'with,' (MATT. xx. 22, 23.) 'I have a baptism to be bap-'tized with and how am I straitened till it be accomplished?' (LUKE xii. 50, see also MARK x. 38, 39.) Our Lord, in these passages, evidently alludes to his last sufferings and death. The Baptists tell us that Christ was plunged into affliction or overwhelmed with it.[1] But these professed elucidations evidently obscure the subject—plunging and overwhelming being directly opposite acts. As to the former expression, it may be remarked that the phrase plunged into affliction, and particularly into a penal suffering for sin, is a mode of speaking, very rare, if ever, used in the New Testament. The punishments inflicted on account of sin—like every good gift and every perfect gift—are from above, and are represented as descending on us. As to the latter, it may be seen from our previous observations, that a person overwhelmed suffers from the pressure of a superincumbent weight—and is at complete variance with our opponents' hypothesis. It is perceivable that drinking the cup and being baptized are here used synonymously, and are both expressive of pain and punishment, without specifying any particular mode of inflicting them. 'To drink,' says Mr. Keach, 'denotes being overwhelmed with calamity,'[2] (Is. li. 20; lxiii. 6. JER. xlviii. 26. EZEK. xxiii. 38. REV. xiv. 10.) But let us come to historical facts. Had our Lord and his disciples suffered death, like Aristobulus, by drowning, our opponents might have had some colour for their conclusions. But neither Jesus, James, nor John, were martyred by dipping or immersion. Christ, as we all know, was crucified; James was killed with a sword, (ACTS xii. 1;) and John, according to universal opinion, and which our opponents

[1] Booth, vol. iii. p. 318. [2] Met. p. 168.

cannot gainsay, died in his bed a natural death. The analogy, therefore, between dipping under water and suffering in any of the preceding forms, is vague and inconsistent. To talk of their being baptized in their own blood, as an argument in favour of modern plunging, betrays a weakness too palpable to require correction. When we can conceive the dyeing of a person with gore issuing from certain bodily wounds, as fairly emblematical of dipping, our imaginations must have lost their sober direction and run wild amidst their vagrant reveries.

The frequent allusion of our brethren to the expressions of the Psalmist, 'he drew me out of many waters,' (Ps. xviii. 16.) 'I am come into deep waters,' (Ps. lxix. 2,) 'and deliver me out of great waters,' (Ps. cxliv. 7;) as if they referred to baptism in the sense of affliction, is perfectly gratuitous and inconclusive—as none of them are designated baptism by the inspired writers, and as there is no proof of David's being dipped by any other being. He speaks of 'waters overflowing' or coming upon him, (Ps. lxix. 2,) 'going over him,' (Ps. xlii. 7,) 'coming nigh unto him,' (Ps. xxxii. 6,) and 'coming into his soul,' (Ps. lxix. 2,) expressive of overwhelming calamity. (See also Ps. xxii. 14.) May we not conclude, then, with equal propriety, that these are baptism also? And as the quantity of the element is not the question at issue, but the act of its application, our inference must be deemed equally proper and tenable. In fact, the whole genius of the gospel is opposed to the interpretation of our opponents. Our Lord was a sinner by imputation, that is, God laid on him the iniquity of us all; and his sufferings were, in accordance with this view of the case, also laid upon him—that is, taken from us and applied to him, for it pleased the Lord to bruise him. Upon the

whole the sufferings mentioned in the passage and designated baptism, will by no means and in no measure countenance the exclusive mode advocated and practiced by our respected antagonists.

IV. We come, now, to the most material allusion contained in the fore-cited passages, which we shall here quote at length. 'Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death—therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death—that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection. Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin,' (Rom. vi. 3-6.)—'And ye are complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power: in whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ. Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead. And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses,' (Col. ii. 10-13.)

1. In considering these passages, it is proper to observe that the apostle is speaking of the union of believers with Christ, and of their mutually suffering death, being buried and raised again in Christ. The Son of God died, was buried, and rose again as the representative of his people—and in him, as their federal head, they virtually died, were bu-

ried, and rose again. This sentiment is well expressed by a Baptist writer of considerable authority. He says, 'by a 'gracious constitution Christ sustained the persons of all 'the elect in his dying and rising again. They were so 'comprehended in and counted one with him, as to have 'died in his death, being buried in his burial, and raised 'again in his resurrection.'[1] The design of the inspired writer is to enforce holiness of life; and he is now urging their spiritual union with Christ, as a cogent motive to effect his purpose. This identification of the Mediator and his people is a prime doctrine of scripture, and the like practical use is made of it in various parts of the New Testament; as must be manifest to all who read the sacred volume with the least attention. In addition to this virtual death, burial, and resurrection of believers, in consequence of their federal union with Christ, he represents, in these passages, the spiritual operations of divine grace in our souls, which he designates circumcision, death, and crucifixion; planting, burial, resurrection, and ascension to newness of life: that is, he exhibits, in metaphorical language, the work of the Holy Ghost in our souls by those outward symbols, between which there is an instructive analogy, perfectly simple to those who were conversant with the customs of antiquity, nor unintelligible to us, with the whole volume of scripture before us.

II. An enquiry now arises, when this apparent and professional union with Christ and work of the Spirit were first recognized by the church. Few will question its taking place at baptism—at least, in the case of adults; for in the apostolic age conversion from Judaism or Gentilism to an acknowledgment of Christ as the Messiah and baptism,

[1] Maclean, v. i. p. 138.

were effected simultaneously. Hence Mr. Robinson remarks, 'there was no intermediate state of scholarship—'baptism was administered immediately on conviction of the 'truth of the report.'[1] Hence the operation of the Spirit and the application of water to a believer in the Saviour's divine mission, are blended as concurrent acts. Wherefore we read, 'born of water and of the Spirit,' (John iii. 5)—'the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy 'Ghost,' (Titus iii. 5)—'can any forbid water, that these 'should not be baptized which have [now] received the 'Holy Ghost?' (Acts x. 47)—and much more might be cited of a similar nature: from which it is easily perceived, how a union of the renovated soul with the Saviour became denominated baptism. Remark also, that in Rom. vi. 4, we are said to be buried with him *(dia)* through baptism, or in consequence of it. And though in Col. ii. 12, it is written, buried with him *(en)* in baptism, it by no means militates against our position, since *en* is often employed in a sense that favours our scheme—being rendered 'through,' 'by,' or 'because of,' one hundred and ninety-six times in the New Testament. Assuming the validity of this remark, both passages mean the same thing, viz: That our apparent union with Christ, in whom, as our federal head, we were buried and rose again, was acknowledged at our dedication by baptism. Our opponents admit that, in Col. ii. 12, 'baptism is considered a principal medium of renovation;'[2] or as 'signifying, outwardly, that they were dead to sin, 'but alive to God.'[3]

III. That this or a similar interpretation of the passages under review, accords with the intentions of the apostle, may be assumed from the incongruity of the exposition

[1] Rob. Hist. p. 234. [2] Keach's Met. p. 183. [3] Jenk. Def. p. 124.

which our opponents are constrained to give them, in order to support their notions of baptism. To illustrate our position, let us paraphrase the texts in consonance with their assertions and sentiments.

> 'Baptized into Christ;' dipped into Christ, immersed into Christ, plunged into Christ!
>
> 'Baptized into his death;' dipped into his death, immersed into his death, plunged into his death!
>
> 'Buried with him by baptism into death;' buried with him by dipping into death, by immersing into death, by plunging into death!
>
> 'Buried with him in baptism;' buried with him in dipping, immersing, or plunging!

Who does not instantly discover the impropriety of such a version, and look for something more analagous with scripture and common sense? Besides which, the ideas attached to these phrases in this paraphrastic version, are, at least, literally erroneous; for the Romans and Colossians addressed were never, in respect of time or place, baptized with Christ. They were surely not dipped into Christ at their baptism, nor plunged into his death! The very attempt at a literal rendering of the passages, appears the height of absurdity. And yet if baptize mean nothing more or less than to dip, immerse, or plunge, such a translation is unavoidable. The simple intention of the writer is, that these converts were, through baptism, separated to a profession of discipleship—of being dead indeed unto sin and alive again unto righteousness. They were buried with him, not by being dipped under water at the same time, by the same administrator, and in the same place; but through baptism, however administered, were initiated into him as their federal and public representative; and through their covenant relation to him, they 'died in his death, were buried in his

'burial, and rose again in his resurrection'—not absolutely and ostensibly with him—nor, for aught the texts say, like him—but in him, through a virtual union with him, as their head and representative. All this is simple, in accordance with the method of salvation, and harmonizing with the general scope of the sacred writings—while the necessary constructions of our brethren are complicated, unscriptural, and even ridiculous. In fact, before our opponents can make these passages answer their purpose, they are obliged to construe the prepositions which, in some measure, govern the action of the verb baptize, in a manner perfectly novel and unwarrantable:—'Buried *like* him in baptism—buried '*like* him through baptism'—meaning either that an ordinary burial with us, is like our Lord's baptism in Jordan, or that their baptism is like his burial in the sepulchre—neither of which, unfortunately for them, is true; nor for what the venerable Paul asserts, is even remotely intended in the fore-cited scriptures; which we shall now proceed to establish.

IV. We contend, then, that our Lord's baptism in Jordan, if he were dipped under water, as our opponents assert, is not like an ORDINARY BURIAL in this country. On their principles, John baptized the Redeemer by plunging him entirely under water and instantly raising him out of it. But this operation is widely different from our usual interments in the following respects:—

First.—The actions are different. A person baptized by our brethren is merely dipped into the water. A person buried is covered with earth—the lowering of the body into a grave being an incidental circumstance—and not truly a part of the literal burying of it. This point is admitted by the Baptists. 'It is true,' say they, 'we do

'bury by casting earth on the dead body, but it is so much 'earth as covers the corpse all over, or it is not buried.'[1] 'The custom of raising tumuli or barrows over the dead 'was universal in the times of the remotest antiquity. Such 'a practice is sufficiently indicative of the original and most 'prominent idea of burial that prevailed in remote antiquity, 'namely, that of committing to the earth [or laying out on 'the earth] and covering with earth.[2] The Greeks and 'Romans entertained the firmest conviction, that their 'souls would not be admitted into the Elysian fields till 'their bodies were buried or committed to the earth. Tra- 'vellers, therefore, who happened to find a dead body, cast 'dirt upon it three times,'[3] [that is, they buried it.] 'Burial, 'as every child knows, is covering the body entirely.'[4] It is of importance to observe that the Jews held similar notions. 'Those whom they caught in the day time were 'slain in the night, and then their bodies were carried out 'and thrown away, that there might be room for other pri- 'soners—and the terror that was upon the people was so 'great, that no one had courage enough openly to weep 'for the dead man that was related to him, or to bury him; 'only in the night time they would take up a little dust 'and throw it upon their bodies; and even some that were 'the most ready to expose themselves to danger, would do 'it in the day time!'[5] Consequently no two acts can be more opposite to each other than a submersion-baptism and an ordinary burial—the former being an immersion into the element—the latter, a pouring or casting of the element on the object.

Secondly.—The periods of interment are different. When

[1] Keach. p. 26. [2] Cox, p. 71. [3] Ib. p. 72. [4] Pearce, p. 20.
[5] Josephus, Hist. Wars, b. 4, c. 5, s. 3.

a corpse, with us, is definitively buried, it is to remain in that state till the end of the world. When our brethren baptize a person, he is kept in a state of baptism for an exceedingly small portion of time. Hence in this respect they by no means correspond. Dr. Ryland encourages the timid candidates for immersion to submit, in the following words: —'You are about to resign yourselves now into the hands 'of your pastor, who having immersed you for a moment 'in the name of the blessed Lord, will easily [if able] and 'instantly raise you out of the water.'[1] Another Baptist writer says, 'I never heard of any who were continued 'half one minute in the water.'[2] Now, who that had no particular end to answer would ever have raised a grave comparison between popping a person momentarily under water and covering a corpse with earth till the great day of a universal resurrection?

Thirdly.—The subsequent operations are different. When our blessed Lord was, according to our opponents' ideas, baptized by John, he was first dipped under water and then instantly raised out of it. And this latter act of the Baptist was not a mere incidental and insignificant consequence of the previous immersion, but an inherent and expressive part of the ceremony. Hence we are told by Mr. Keach, 'that 'cannot be Christ's true baptism wherein there is not, can-'not be, a lively representation of the death, burial, and 'resurrection of Jesus Christ.'[3] And Mr. Burt says, 'bap-'tism is designed to represent unto us things of the greatest 'importance and concern, viz: the death, burial, and resur-'rection of our blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.'[4] But in a burial, this raising again is wanting; for though all of us shall be raised at the last day, yet a resurrection is

[1] P. 31. [2] Rees, p. 133. [3] P. 318. [4] P. 13.

not included in the act of burying; which might be performed, though men never left their sepulchres.

There are, therefore, three discrepancies in the case before us, which completely destroy the analogical arguments which our opponents so complacently erect on the allusions under consideration. In fact, those who fancy such a similarity as our opponents plead for, are entirely mistaken; for, as Mr. Robinson justly remarks, 'the first English 'Baptists, when they read the phrase, buried in baptism, 'instantly thought of an English burial, and therefore 'baptized by laying the body in the form of burying in 'their own country; but they might have observed that 'Paul wrote to Romans, and that Romans [at that period] 'did not bury but burned the dead, and buried nothing 'of the dead but their ashes in urns; so that no fair rea-'soning on the form of baptizing can be drawn from the 'mode of burying the dead in England.'[1]

v. We next contend that our opponents' baptism is not like our SAVIOUR'S BURIAL. Mr. Butterworth assures us, that 'it is the noble design of this ordinance to represent a 'buried and risen Saviour.'[2] But in this case the discrepancies are as great as in the preceding. When our opponents baptize a convert, he, as a voluntary agent, walks knee or middle deep into the water—then he permits the officiating minister to put the upper part of his body entirely under—then he is raised on his legs, and walks away to shift his dress. This is just as exhibited in practice—though somewhat at variance with the sense they give to the verb baptize. Now the dissimilarity between this ceremony and the interment of Christ is glaring. Christ did not walk into the sepulchre—Joseph of Arimathea did not lower his

[1] Hist. p. 550. [2] Conf. Weighed, p. 19, 24.

body into a grave, nor aid in raising him out of it afterwards. He, being entirely passive, was carried into, or up into, a room hewn out of a rock, in an elevated position[1]—laid on the floor, or rather on a side stone bench, as Dorcas was laid in an upper chamber, (Acts ix. 37)—a great stone was rolled against the door or opening of the sepulchre—and the people departed, intending after the Sabbath finally to inter his precious body. Before they arrived, however, the angel of the Lord rolled the stone from the mouth of the cave, and the Saviour, without the aid of the Counsellor, or his friends, left the mansion of death. Who that was not exceedingly blinded in favour of an hypothesis, and determined to maintain it at all events, could even fancy a likeness between two ceremonies so void of every feature of fair analogy!

A judicious writer remarks, that 'the sepulchres of antiquity possessed but little similarity to our graves. A large excavation was made in the side of a rock—the floor of the chamber thus formed not being at all below the surface of the soil without—and this chamber was a tomb. Of the grave of Lazarus, we are told it was a cave. That our Lord's sepulchre was of this kind, must be inferred from the phraseology used respecting it by the inspired historians. Matthew and Mark declare it to have been *hewn out of a rock*. Mary Magdalene and the other Mary are represented as sitting *over against* the sepulchre. We are informed that Joseph rolled a great stone *to the door* of the sepulchre. An angel of the Lord on the morning of the third day came and rolled back the stone *from the door*, and sat upon it. The entrance, or door, was low, not much more elevated than was necessary to admit the corpse;

[1] See Bp. Lowth's Notes on Is. xxii. 16, and liii. 9.

LIBRARY UNIVERSITY CALIFORNIA

'therefore we read, that when the disciples came to search 'of the body, they *stooped down* to look into the sepul- 'chre.'[1] Besides this, our Redeemer remained in this room at least, a part of three days and three nights: whereas, in modern immersion, the person is not (barring accidents) kept under water half a minute; and when emerged, it is by the minister either alone, or, in case he be heavy, with the aid of the deacons. In a word, so far from there being a proper similitude between the dipping of our opponents and the interment of Christ, the one is no more like the other than plunging a person into a pond and carrying a corpse into a chamber and stretching it on a bed. A further development of the discrepancy is not requisite.—We do not design by these observations, however, to insinuate for a moment that the predictions and declarations respecting the interment of our blessed Lord were not perfectly fulfilled as far as intended by the Holy Spirit, or that his precious body was not placed in a state which the Jews designated burial, and for a period which they accounted three days and three nights. It is, however, plain, that Christ was in the sepulchre only about thirty-six hours out of seventy-two, and subject only to a preparation for final interment, and not fully interred. This analogy between the time and the circumstances of our Lord's burial, as respectively predicted and detailed in the New Testament, throws a considerable degree of light on this subject, and materially favours our position.

VI. Perhaps the sense of the words to baptize and to bury, in the texts under review, is not so plain and settled as our opponents presume. Can they tell us whether the baptism of water or of the Holy Ghost is intended by

[1] Urwick's Concise View, p. 54, 55. See also Cox, p. 74.

the apostle? They suppose the former—but would feel some difficulty to prove it—as, also, to determine whether the body to be interred was that of sin, mentioned in the preceding verse, (Col. ii. 11,) and which is the simplest exposition of the passage, or of the Colossians themselves, referred to in the tenth verse of the same chapter. Nor would they be less perplexed in settling the import of the word to bury in the fore-cited text. That Christ was not definitively interred, is plain, from the fact that it was to be done on the first day of the week, and probably in some other place of sepulchre; therefore the term cannot mean 'covering the body entirely, which every child knows to 'be burial.' Depositing the body in the sepulchre was probably intended—but perhaps something else, or more, was meant. Parkhurst tells us that the original word signifies 'not only to bury or inter, according to its usual sense in 'the profane writers, but also includes the preparation of 'the body for burial, by washing, anointing, &c.' Schleusner renders it, 'the preparation of the body for sepulchre.' The same Greek word is used in the Septuagint, (Gen. l.26) to express the embalming of Joseph, who was not finally interred till hundreds of years after, (Ex. xiii. 19; Josh. xxiv. 32.) The anointing of Christ before his death, is called his burial, (Matt. xxvi. 12;) and it is said, proleptically, to have been done on the day of his burial, (John xii. 7.) Ananias and his wife are said to have been buried, when, from the short time employed about it, three hours, and the ignorance of their relatives, respecting the bereavement, nothing more than washing, anointing, and similar preparatory rites, as performed in the case of Dorcas, (Acts ix. 27,) and common among the Jews, (Acts v. 1-10,) could be intended.

It is also remarkable that the word *thapto*, translated to 'bury,' in the passages under consideration, is only once used in the narrative of Christ's interment, and that for the preparation of the body for the subsequent burial, (JOHN xix. 40.) When the inspired writers speak of the action in debate, they all use another word, *tithemi*, rendered 'laid,' or placed in the sepulchre for the time, (MATT. xxvii. 60; MARK xv. 46; LUKE xxiii. 53; JOHN xix. 42.) The question of the pious women that sought the body of Christ on the first day of the week, was, 'where have they laid 'him?' (JOHN xx. 2; xiii. 15.) The angels were sitting on the place 'where Christ had lain,' (JOHN xx. 12;) and said, 'behold where they laid him,' (MARK xvi. 6;) 'come, see the place where the Lord lay,' (MATT. xxviii. 6.) Is it, therefore, not fair to infer that the angels, women, and the Evangelists, considered our Saviour not buried definitively, and that the word in question refers only to the anointing, &c? Supposing this to be the sense of the term buried, in the preceding passages, and which our opponents will feel it difficult to disprove, what becomes of all their boasted assertions and indisputable evidence in favour of dipping?

VII. Our brethren regard baptism as a sacramental representation of the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ. 'That,' says Keach, 'cannot be Christ's true baptism 'wherein there is not, cannot be, a lively representation of 'the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus Christ.' But the same writer tells us in the same page, that 'the sacra-'ment of the Lord's supper was ordained to represent his 'body was broke and his blood was shed.' On this principle of interpretation both sacraments symbolize the death of Christ. Our opponents, we presume, can tell us on what

ground they administer one of these sacraments once a month or once a week, and the other only once in a believer's life-time? Why is such a distinction made, if the design of both is one and the same? But there is another obstacle to their position and inference. The Lord's supper fully comprehends the objects intended by the sacred Institutor—a memorial of his death and the communion of saints. But the baptism of our antagonists, under the notion of burying, is very defective, not representing a tithe of what the scriptures and themselves declare it to symbolize. For example, in Gal. iii. 27, it is said, 'as many of you as 'have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.' Here the design is general and full, the person being consecrated to the profession of all the doctrines, duties, and privileges, of the gospel. In 1 Cor. xii. 13, Paul says, 'for by one 'spirit we are all baptized into one body, whether we be 'Jews or Gentiles;' that is, not only into a participation of the death of Christ, but into the visible church with all its advantages and obligations. Our opponents tell us, as we shall presently verify, that baptism is designed 'to represent 'a minister's washing a person'—'God's washing away 'his sins by the blood of Christ'—'an act of worship to 'God'—'an emblem of sanctification'—they also call it 'purification'—'a washing all over'—and 'abundant pu-'rification'—none of which effects are represented by baptism as a burial, which they assure us is quite a different thing from washing.[1] The visible descent of the Holy Spirit, which is frequently designated baptism, is also totally neglected in a burial. So that were we even to admit the ostensible consistency between their baptism and a burial, other acknowledged intentions of the first importance in

[1] Cox, p. 60. See Maclean, v. i. p. 112.

Christian baptism are excluded. And, consequently, their system on this plan is partial and defective. Nor should it be forgotten that all the inhabitants of Jerusalem, of Judea, and of all the region round about Jordan, were baptized by John and our Lord's disciples when they entertained not the slightest idea of Christ's passion or burial—therefore they could not have administered this rite with a reference to his interment, nor have considered it in the least degree characteristic of a burial, previous to the crucifixion [1]—nor, for any thing we read, did they ever afterward contemplate such an allusion as our opponents plead for.

VIII. On the expressions in the passages under review, our opponents endeavour to establish a rite in their churches representing, in their esteem, the burial of Christ and his resurrection from the dead. But their process of reasoning on the texts, obliges them to derange the order observed by the sacred penman and to omit a full compliance with what *they* must conclude to be his design. *First*, they derange the order observed by the sacred penman. They talk of, first, a death, secondly, a burial, and thirdly, a resurrection. Whereas, Paul speaks first of a burial, secondly of a planting, and thirdly, of a crucifixion. By what authority is this mutation of the divine arrangements? But our antagonists feel it necessary. To talk of, first, burying, secondly, planting, and, thirdly, crucifying, and to apply the order to their baptizing, was too absurd for their adoption or avowal. Had the Holy Ghost intended by the texts, to establish a system, such as we presume to say the Baptists have invented, his language—(on the natural order of which their scheme as to the proper subjects chiefly depends, MATT. xxviii. 19; ACTS ii. 38, 41; viii. 12; x. 47)—is every way incorrect,

[1] See Hall's Essent. Diff. p. 16.

and before they can even imagine, from these words, a shadow of resemblance, they are forced, contrary to their avowed practice, to torture the text and entirely derange the sacred narrative. *Secondly*, they omit a full compliance with what they must conclude to have been the apostle's design. He makes other allusions in the immediate connexion which they totally disregard. 'Ye are *circumcised* with the cir-'cumcision of Christ.'—'Our old man is *crucified* with 'him.'—'We have been *planted* together in the likeness of 'his death.' Why are all these expressions overlooked? To be consistent with their profession they should, in some way or other, represent the acts of circumcision, crucifixion, and planting. Why is burying singled out before all the rest? Was it an after thought, and recurred to as a prop of a cause previously espoused? What we solicit is consistency—symbolize all, or none. The preference of burying to planting is remarkable, as the latter is expressly said to be in the *likeness* of his death. The apostle also speaks in another place of 'being made conformable unto his death,' yet not to his burial, (PHIL. iii. 10.) But the adoption of the principle further than positively established, would lead to the most superstitious results. 'We are commanded, 'to put on the Lord Jesus Christ'—to imitate him in 'wash-'ing one another's feet'—'to shine as lights in the world.' But where shall we find, among our friends, an ostensible and analogous exhibition of these actions? To be consistent with their principles, they ought, at least, to erect crucifixes —to use lighted candles in their chapels—or in some way to set forth these mental and spiritual allusions—or cease to plead the afore-cited passages as reasons for dipping. Hence, we conclude, that our opponents have failed to establish their exclusive scheme of baptismal immersion, from the allusions of scripture to this divine ordinance.

SECTION EIGHTH.

THE IMMUTABLE NATURE OF SCRIPTURE PRECEDENTS.

Our opponents, confidently assuming that their mode of baptism fully and minutely corresponds with that practised by the apostles of our Lord, contend that we should, on no account, depart in the smallest matters from the primitive model.—*Dr. Gale* says, 'I think it is clear, that nothing can 'be baptism which varies from Christ's institution.'[1]—*Mr. Dore* affirms, that 'what is not commanded by Christ, or 'practised by his apostles, is virtually forbidden as will-'worship.'[2]—*Mr. Booth* says, 'no additions should be made 'by human authority [or intervention] to the positive ap-'pointments of Jesus Christ; and it is not lawful, under 'any pretence, either to corrupt or depart from the primitive 'institution of those appointments.'[3] 'Except it be main-'tained that positive ordinances are to be entirely governed 'by positive law and primitive example, it is impossible for 'the Antipedobaptists to stand their ground by fair argument 'in various cases, when disputing with Pedobaptists as 'such.'[4]—*Mr. Gibbs* asserts, that 'the subjects as well as the 'mode must accord with the precept and practice of the 'New Testament: to alter either of these is to perform a 'new rite, and not the one which Christ has ordained. To 'plead for this practice, as some do, on the ground that what 'is not prohibited is lawful, is to open a wide door indeed 'for the admission of human inventions into the worship of 'God.'[5]—Similar declarations might be cited from most Baptist writings. They assure us that a particular and un-

[1] P. 66. [2] Introd. p. 19. [3] Vol. i. p. 26.
[4] Ib. p. 462, Ed. 1784; Apology, p. 378. [5] P. 8, 9.

alterable adherence to what they denominate scripture precept and apostolical practice, is essential to the maintenance of their system. After what has been advanced, a refutation of this evidence might have been omitted, had it not been resolved to give their views of the mode of baptism a full, as well as a fair, investigation. In contemplating this position, we shall argue on the principles of our opponents: and now solicit your attention to the following remarks:—

I. Our opponents presume that they have clearly discovered the primitive practice and scrupulously copy it. But perhaps in this respect they display a little too much self-confidence. 'This ordinance,' says Mr. Burt, 'is laid down 'so plain in the sacred rule of scripture, that he who runs 'may read it. And it must be highly criminal for any man 'to say or suppose that the divine Lawgiver should leave 'that ordinance under any veil which must be administered 'in those awful names that are used in holy baptism. No 'serious Christian dares entertain so cruel a thought of Jesus, 'our dear Redeemer, as that he should have so little love 'and value for his ministers, as to leave them at uncertainty 'in this important case.'[1]—All this is very plausible and pious; but can our friends answer the following questions, which are far from frivolous?—

1. Did the persons to be baptized walk into the water, or were they carried in by the baptizer? That is, did they partly baptize themselves, or were they wholly baptized by the officiating minister? For, in modern dipping, the minister never baptizes the feet and legs of the subjects—this being done by themselves.

11. If the people walked into the water, to what depth did they go?—up to the ancles, knees, middle, or neck?—

[1] Treatise, p. 18. See Dr. Stennett, Part II. p. 4.

for now, many ministers dip little more than the head and shoulders of the candidates.

III. Were the people baptized naked or dressed? If dressed, was it partially or fully? Were the men and women attired alike or differently? In their ordinary apparel, or in dresses made on purpose? If the latter, were the men in black and the women in white, or not? Had they weights at the bottom of their garments, to make them sink into the water?

IV. Were the baptized plunged backward or forward? Were they immersed once, twice, or three times? Were they dipped only, or also subsequently affused, as in the Greek, Abyssinian, and other eastern churches? Were they wetted only by a simple dipping, or washed by manual or other friction, as in some oriental communions?

V. Did the disciples attend to the literal injunction of our Lord, by baptizing in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, or only in the name of the Lord Jesus? If there be no instance where the rite was administered in the name of the adorable Trinity, how do our opponents, on their principles, justify the practice?

VI. Was there only one person employed to dip a convert, or was he assisted by others—especially when the minister was small and feeble and the candidate stout, tall, and weighty.

VII. Did they ever warm the water in cold seasons or countries? Did they ever baptize the people privately? Did they ever construct baptismal fonts? Did the minister ever dress in a particular garb for the occasion? Did he ever wear under garments, to keep out the water from his legs?

VIII. Was the mode invariably the same in all places

and for all persons—males and females—the delicate lady of the court and the rustic ploughman of the field—the sickly and the hale—the bed-ridden and the active?—Were they all treated precisely in the same manner?

IX. When persons were affected under a sermon, so as to cry for mercy, or confess their belief that Jesus was the Son of God, were they all baptized immediately—whether provided with proper dresses or not—whether ignorant of religion as a system or not?—Were they ever kept as catechumens and candidates for baptism for a month, or a year, or at all?

X. Was the faith of discipleship or of salvation necessary? Was an individual confession made before the church or congregation previous to baptism? If so, in what did it consist? What was the nature and extent of the instruction required previous to receiving this ordinance? And who were the persons that judged in this case—the minister alone, or the people with him, or without him?

These questions might have been considerably enlarged, but can they be answered? If not, with what consistency can our opponents dilate so largely on scripture precedent, and the absolute necessity of a strict, individual, and undeviating adherence to it, for a legitimate performance of this ceremony—when, in truth, they confessedly know not how it was originally understood and observed. Having no means of information on this subject which we do not possess, are they inspired by Heaven to decide, at pleasure, what was formerly done and what now shall render their rite valid in the absence of sufficient data and unimpeachable credentials?

II. But though our opponents cannot answer the preceding interrogatories, they still persist that the manner is,

or ought to have been, as definitively settled as the Jewish ceremonies or the eucharist. Let us hear their own words :— 'Baptism is a positive institution of Christ, and, agreeably 'to his infinite wisdom and goodness, he has expressed him- 'self in the most clear and explicit manner respecting both 'the mode and the subject of it.'[1]—'Such laws admit of no 'commutation, mutilation, or alteration by human au- 'thority.'[2]—'Baptism being a positive institution, as well 'as those ancient rites [of circumcision, sprinkling of blood, 'anointing with oil, and other Levitical ceremonies,] what 'reason can be assigned, if water should be applied to a 'particular part of the body, why that part was not men- 'tioned, either in the institution of the ordinance or in some 'apostolic example of its administration.'[3]—'Circumcision 'was ordained, and every minutia of it expressly settled— 'so was the passover—so the Lord's supper. In like man- 'ner in baptism, every thing is clear, and we are not left to 'guess at the element to be made use of, or the form of 'words to be repeated on the occasion—all is express 'and explicit.'[4]—On these assertions a few observations are requisite.

1. According to the above statements and deductions, the mode of baptism is expressed in the most clear and explicit manner; and which is unquestionably to dip the whole body of the candidate under water and take it up again. But to whom is this mode so plain? Not to one in ten of the inhabitants of this empire. But it is as plain as the *Levitical ceremonies* under the law. This we deny; since the Hebrews were, in many cases, restricted to specific rules unknown to the ordinance of baptism, as will be

[1] S. Stennett, Part II. p. 4.
[2] Maclean, vol. iii. p. 244.
[3] Booth, vol. i. p. 96, 97.
[4] Jenkin's Def. p. 23.

proved hereafter. But then it ought to be as plain? But how do our opponents know this? Surely God is the best judge how precisely he shall circumscribe his ordinances—whether the most ignorant and thoughtless should understand them as well as the intelligent and enquiring. Is not this presuming to dictate to Infinite Wisdom how to prescribe laws and relate passing events? Is it not 'directing 'the Spirit of the Lord, and giving counsel to the Most 'High God?'

11. But we may enquire whether there are not other corresponding institutions of an equally positive nature, in which Christ is equally remote from restricting the hands of his servants to minute and unvarying rules of action? Several things might be referred to under the law, but we shall come to the gospel, and consider the duties of preaching and prayer. And we ask are these so expressly regulated by Christ in his commissions as to admit of no variety? Were all the apostles commanded to *preach* exactly alike, as to matter and form? Were they to preach only on stated days, or at any time? Were they to address their audiences in their ordinary apparel, or in some ministerial robes? Or might all these be diversified according to circumstances —such as place, time, audience, and opportunity? When they engaged in *prayer*, was it according to a particular form prescribed, in part or wholly; or were they left to begin, continue, and end, according to their own discretion? Were the character and the qualification of evangelists so settled that none but those minutely described should officiate? Were all those sent to preach, sent also to baptize? If not, wherein lies the difference between a preaching and a baptizing minister? Was the erection of chapels, excavation of baptistries, and the like, enjoined or left to arise ac-

cording as occasion should dictate? Let our brethren find, if they can, in these all-important institutions, the minute regulations which they plead for in respect of baptism.

III. But they refer us to the *Lord's supper*, as containing a specimen of explicit and immutable legislation. In reply, we ask them whether this sacrament is so verbally and positively fixed that all must observe it exactly alike, or become culpable for deviating from the revealed will of the Legislator. Hath Christ so specified the time, place, posture, guests, form of words, the quality and quantity of the bread and wine, that no serious persons can ignorantly err respecting his intentions? Let our brethren also find, if they are able, in this sister sacrament, the minute regulations they plead for in baptism. Further, did the Son of God intend the Lord's supper to be a symbolical or a pictorial representation of his sufferings and death? If the former, as Dr. Gill asserts,[1] the precise mode must, in their view, be immaterial. If the latter, it is every way defective—for surely a stranger to Christianity, witnessing the administration of this sacrament for the first time, would never conclude that the ceremony was just like a person agonizing in a garden or dying upon a cross. And why might not baptism be rather a symbolical than a pictorial representation of the great lessons it inculcates.

IV. From these references it is manifest that our opponents, with their notions, would find some difficulty in proving that the ordinance of baptism should be settled in every iota by the Institutor, or exemplified precisely by the apostles. When Dr. Jenkins talks of every thing being clear and explicit as the minutiæ of circumcision, the passover, purification, and the eucharist, we naturally look for a con-

[1] P. 218.

firmation of the sentiment; but behold, we are 'not left to 'guess at the element to be made use of or the form of 'words to be repeated on the occasion!' This is what we never disputed, and, therefore, the declaration merely serves to blind the eyes of ignorant people, by leading them to suppose that all other things are precisely settled in their favour by the Holy Spirit. When Mr. Booth asks, 'what 'reason can be assigned if water should be applied to a 'particular part of the body, why that part was not men-'tioned or exemplified in practice?'[1]—we would reply, first, that our Baptist friends never apply water to the body, but the body to the water; and, secondly, we would employ the language of a Menonite Baptist, who says, 'nor do 'I remember it is any where said, that the person baptized 'was covered with water or was put under it; and had 'this been the case, I can hardly think the scripture would 'have been entirely silent about it; but in some place or 'other it would have been expressly mentioned, especially 'if it be a circumstance of such importance as some persons 'suppose and contend for.'[2]—Now, Mr. Booth wonders, if water was to be applied to a particular part of the body, why it was not mentioned; and Mr. Elliott wonders, if it were to be totally covered or dipped, why it was not recorded; and perhaps one wonder is tantamount to the other, which is all we require.

III. But let us for a moment suppose our opponents to be absolutely certain, that a mode similar to their own was generally or always observed by the harbinger and apostles of our Lord, is it necessary with an undeviating scrupulosity to adhere to it now, in this and every other country where the gospel is preached? If so, it must arise either from ex-

[1] Vol. I. p. 96, 97. [2] Elliott's Dipping not Baptizing.

plicit and positive enactments, or the inherent character of the ceremony. The latter we deny, and, being the topic in debate, it will not be received without competent evidence. If it follow from the nature of positive institutions generally, ought not all positive laws to be thus interpreted? But do our brethren observe this rule? Are they not continually neglecting the performance of positive injunctions and the plainest examples of scripture—quite as positive and plain as their particular and exclusive mode of immersion-baptism? We will prove this fact in several indisputable instances.

I. Christ washed his disciples' feet at the feast of the passover and the institution of the sacrament, saying, 'If I 'then, your Lord and master, have washed your feet, ye 'also ought to wash one another's feet,' (JOHN xiii. 14.) But this is neglected.

II. James, says, 'is any sick among you, let him call for 'the elders of the church—and let them pray over him, 'anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord,' (JAMES v. 14, compare MARK vi. 13.) This is neglected.

III. Paul enforces the kiss of charity—'salute one another 'with an holy kiss, (ROM. xvi. 16,) greet one another with 'an holy kiss, (1 COR. xvi. 20,) greet all the brethren with 'an holy kiss,' (1 THESS. v. 26.) Peter, says, 'greet 'one another with a kiss of charity,' (1 PETER v. 14.) This also is neglected, as are the feasts of charity mentioned by Jude, (v. 12.)

IV. When the Lord's supper was instituted and the model of its observance first given, it was on a Thursday evening, in a large upper room, with only eleven or twelve communicants, all of them males, after eating the passover, with unleavened bread, and in a reclining posture, (LUKE xxii. 7-20.) Are these rules observed?

v. Our Lord and his disciples observed the seventh day of the week previous to his passion, and his disciples kept the seventh as well as the first afterwards. Nor have we any command for making an alteration, (Luke iv. 16; Acts xvii. 2.) Do our opponents proceed in the same manner?

vi. We are commanded by the apostles, assembled at Jerusalem, to abstain from things strangled and from blood, (Acts xv. 20, 29.) But do not most of our brethren partake, more or less, of these prohibited eatables?

vii. The primitive Christians had all things in common, (Acts iv. 32.) Why do not the opulent members of the Baptist communion adopt a similar practice? Surely their poor communicants would highly approve of the plan!

viii. Poor Christian widows, when sixty years of age, were supported by the voluntary contributions of the church, and deacons were appointed to serve their tables and minister to their daily necessities, (Acts vi. 1-4; 1 Tim. v. 3-10.) But were is this law observed by our brethren?

ix. When people first heard the word of God, and confessed their belief in Christ as the true Messiah, whether truly converted or not, they were all baptized without the least delay, (Acts ii. 41—viii. 12, 37, 38—x. 47, 48—xvi. 33.) Is this precedent followed?

x. Whenever the apostles baptized a person *at* the head of his family, they invariably baptized his *(oikos)* children also, (Acts xvi. 15, 23, &c.) Do our opponents in England, India, or elsewhere, follow this apostolical example?

Whence then arises all the parade about an undeviating adherence to primitive example and positive law? Let our friends be consistent or silent, whichever they please; or, as one of them says on another occasion, 'if this is their

'supposed warrant, why do they not keep exactly to the 'rule of that commission?'[1]

IV. But our opponents are not only inconsistent by omitting many things they know to have been enjoined or practised—they also perform various others of a sacred nature, or associated with their religious worship, for which they find no examples, nor can justly plead the least divine authority. Let us propose a few more appropriate questions, for the purpose of illustrating the truth of our assertion :—

I. What express precept or precedent have our opponents, in the New Testament, for erecting chapels, with pews and pulpit—for employing choirs and instruments of music[2]—for singing hymns of human and uninspired composition—and for their particular mode of ministering in holy things?

II. What express precept or precedent have our esteemed brethren for administering the Lord's supper weekly or monthly—for using leavened bread and port wine—and for admitting females to participate in this communion?

III. What precept or precedent have they in the New Testament for 'uniting with the parents of *a new-born* '*child*, in reading some portion of scripture on the occasion '—returning thanks to the Giver of all good, and recom-'mending the *infant* to God in earnest prayer?'[3]—in fact, for performing all the parts of baptism, except applying the water?[4]

IV. What express precept or precedent have they for baptizing the adult offspring of parents who were Christians or believers at the time of their childrens' birth or infancy?

[1] Burt, p. 35. [2] See Booth, vol. ii. p. 261-264.
[3] Booth, vol. ii. p. 343. [4] See New Evang. Mag. vol. ix. p. 173.

v. What command or example do they plead for digging baptistries in their chapels or near them—for making them water-proof—with steps to descend—with wells, pumps, and shoots, to fill them—and with sewers under, to drain off the water after baptism?

vi. What divine authority do they plead for making dresses peculiar to the occasion—black for the men and white for the women—with leads at the bottom, to make them sink, and thereby avoid an exposure of the person—or for 'deacons using wands, to press the floating clothes 'beneath the water?'

vii. What precept or precedent is pleaded for the ministers using a different robe in baptizing than in preaching—for wearing, like the late Dr. Ryland, mud boots made of leather, water-proof, and reaching above the middle—or for singing hymns, praying, and delivering orations at baptism?

viii. What precedent have our opponents for employing women with cloaks, to throw over the heads and shoulders of the ladies who come up out of the water, to hide the clipness of their clothes from appearing to the crowd—or for standing between the baptized and the congregation, and hurrying them, breathless, into the adjoining rooms?

ix. What divine authority do they bring for warming the water in the baptistry—for having double vestries, with a fire in each—for placing tubs in them, to receive the wet clothes—and for giving the baptized wine or spirits and water, to cheer their spirits or prevent a chill?

x. What precedent have they for dipping a person once rather than thrice—or, when a first dipping is not absolute and entire submersion, for dipping him a second time till wholly under water?

Not to particularize further, we have shown you that our opponents do many things, even in the rite before us, for which they can plead neither precept nor example, and consequently, that their baptism, on their own principles, is invalid; for they assure us, that 'nothing is or can be a part 'of Christian worship which is not recommended either by 'precept or example in the Holy Scriptures' [1]—that 'to go 'beyond or come short of what is expressly noted in the 'scriptures of truth, with respect to a positive institute, 'is to set aside the institution itself, and to practise a human 'rite' [2]—that 'in the worship of God, nothing therein as 'worship is to be admitted without some plain and ex-'press word, by precept or practice, to warrant the same out 'of the New Testament' [3]—and that 'as *nothing* should be 'excluded from the worship of God which Christ hath ap-'pointed, so *nothing* should be added by human authority: 'he alone, as legislator of his own kingdom, can alter or annul 'what he hath himself commanded. To interfere with the 'economy of things established in his church, is to be wise 'above what is written, and to invade the prerogatives of *his* 'office, who is head over all things to his church, which is 'his body, the fulness of him who filleth all in all.' [4]

V. The only attempt at vindicating these innovations must be founded on one or other of the following propositions:—

1. 'That the manners and *customs* of our age and 'country require all those precautions and conveniencies.' But while any denomination of believers, except the Baptists, might plead this argument—in their mouths, and following the fore-cited passages—it becomes inconsistent in

[1] Pearce, p. 14. See Maclean, vol. i. p. 119. [2] Paice's Serm. p. 8.
[3] D'Anver's Innoc. p. 66, 67. [4] Gibbs, p. 253.

the extreme; since they profess to act not on deductions drawn from scripture, but on a strict and unvarying adherence to its primitive forms and ceremonies. Besides, they make many additions, alterations, and omissions, which the change of climate and customs by no means renders necessary. For instance—what has the change of climate or manners of the people to do with the administration of the Lord's supper, as to place, time, element, sex, or posture? What have the climate and customs to do with the kiss and feasts of charity, anointing the sick with oil, observing the seventh day of the week, eating blood or things strangled, having all things in common? What have the climate or customs to do with baptizing immediately on conviction—supporting aged Christian widows—and a dozen other things which might be enumerated? If they still contend that the climate and customs of the age and country make these alterations prudent and essential, we will answer in the language of Mr. Booth—'So, then, the voice of national decency is to be heard and the force of local customs 'is to be felt in the administration of a divinely positive 'rite, even though the will of the Institutor be the sole 'ground of this institution.'[1]—If our opponents consider any rite specifically enjoined by Christ or precisely administered by the apostles, on their own principles, they are bound to observe it exactly in the same manner. That they are inconsistent with themselves and act contrary to the professions they are constantly making, we have fully established: and if a deviation in many cases is allowable, as in preaching, and prayer, and the Lord's supper, why not in baptism itself; and if our good friends make so many omissions, alterations, and appendages to this ordi-

[1] Vol. iii. p. 118, 119.

nance, how can they honestly complain of us for going, as they deem it, a little further than themselves? and with what propriety are they continually assailing us and their people with their doctrine of positive institutions and the immutable nature of scripture precedents?

11. It is answered, 'that the things enumerated above are 'merely *circumstantial* and indifferent.'[1] But how do our opponents know that the precise mode of applying water to the baptized, is not also a mere circumstance of baptism? That they have not proved the action of total immersion an essential and inherent part of scripture baptism, has been sufficiently demonstrated; and for ought they have adduced to the contrary, their dipping may be as much a circumstance as the other ceremonies invariably introduced by them, and which are requisite to the performance of this rite as administered in their communion. They first arbitrarily assume, and then fearlessly assert, that to baptize is to dip the whole body, and that dipping is the essence of the sacrament. Consequently, all the preparations, accompaniments, and appendages, are mere incidents varied at will. But let them verify the justice of their assumption, before they draw such a sheltering conclusion. Besides, how can they, on their principles of interpreting positive laws and institutions, prove that such circumstantials are not objectionable in the sight of God. If 'what is not com-'manded by Christ or practised by his apostles, is virtually 'forbidden as will-worship;'[2] and 'if scripture forbids what 'it does not mention,'[3] as our opponents contend, they are no more warranted in their additions or alterations than the Roman Catholics are in the most superstitious branches of their worship; and the latter might, with equal propriety,

[1] Booth, v. i. p. 125-128. [2] Dore's Introd. p. 19. [3] Booth, v. ii. p. 16.

plead that all their ceremonies were but mere incidents and circumstantials of their service: and if 'to come short of 'what is noted in the scriptures of truth, with respect to a 'positive institution, is to set aside the institution itself,'[1] our brethren are as guilty, in many cases before mentioned, as they can conceive us to be for not dipping our converts: besides, acting in opposition to their avowed principles. Indeed, one of their most intelligent and respectable advocates says, 'that what is performed as an act of worship 'or a religious duty, if it has not the authority of scripture, 'is sinful and of a bad tendency.'[2]

VI. We have now examined all the material evidence adduced by our opponents in support of their exclusive system of immersion, which they pronounce not only scriptural but the only valid mode of baptism. From what has been advanced, we consider it indubitably established, that they have not proved, and cannot maintain, their point—that their mode of baptism is supported by partial evidence, distorted facts, illegitimate deductions, and sophistical reasonings—and which, when fairly investigated, prove no better than the baseless fabric of a vision, that vanishes on opening our eyes and exercising our rational faculties. To conclude, in the language of the Rev. Mr. Watson, a Wesleyan minister of great respectability and penetration: 'it is satisfactory to discover that all the attempts made to 'impose upon Christians a practice repulsive to the feelings, 'dangerous to the health, and offensive to delicacy, is destitute of all scriptural authority, and of really primitive 'practice.'[3]

[1] Pearce, p. 8. [2] S. Stennett, Part II. p. 168. [3] Theol. Inst. v. iii. p. 444.

PART SECOND.

WE SHALL ADDUCE A VARIETY OF CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE TO PROVE THAT OURS IS THE ONLY PROPER MODE OF CHRISTIAN BAPTISM.

It has been shewn, we hope, to your entire satisfaction, that the testimonies adduced by our respected opponents, in favour of their exclusive scheme of immersion baptism, are fatally defective—and that consequently their cause is lost. Our object at present is to convince you that pouring or sprinkling, or applying the element to the object, is the only valid method of administering this Christian sacrament.

In the prosecution of our enquiry we shall be as plain and concise as the nature of the subject will fairly admit. Occasional repetitions, however, in controversies of this nature are often unavoidable; similar evidence and arguments are frequently necessary for the establishment of distinct and even dissimilar propositions. Hence, though our preceding remarks have been entirely devoted to the overthrow of our opponents' scheme, and our subsequent observations are chiefly directed to the establishment of our own; yet much that has been already advanced might have been arranged under this second head of our discourse—and a considerable part of what will yet be adduced might have been brought forward in the preceding discussion. In a subject of this extensive and diversified nature such a method could not be conveniently avoided.

We beg to remind you that the question at issue between us and our esteemed brethren, is not which of us performs

the ceremony of baptism in the better or more scriptural manner—but which of us is only or exclusively right. For if our respective modes are as opposite as applying the person to the water, and applying the water to the person—both cannot be scriptural, and therefore not valid. 'If,' says *Dr. Jenkins*, 'the words of the apostle, (Eph. iv. 5,) 'are to be regarded, there can be but one baptism, as but 'one faith. So that dipping *or* sprinkling must be the true 'mode. Both cannot be true.'[1] Our opponents assert that they are exclusively right, and that we are altogether in the wrong. 'I affirm,' says *Mr. Burt*, 'without presumption, 'that sprinkling or pouring water on the face, is not bap-'tism.'[2] *Dr. Gale*, says, 'they who are not duly baptized '[that is, plunged under water] are certainly not baptized 'at all.'[3] *Dr. Gill*, says, 'baptism must be performed by 'immersion, without which it cannot be baptism.'[4] *Mr. Keach*, observes, 'that cannot be true baptism, wherein 'there is not, cannot be, a lively representation of the death, 'burial, and resurrection, of Jesus Christ.'[5] We, on the other hand, feel no hesitation in asserting, with equal confidence, that dipping, plunging, or immersing a person into the water, is not scripture baptism, and that if a precise conformity to scripture precept and apostolical example be requisite to constitute a valid performance of a positive institution, as our opponents assert, it is not baptism at all—and that all our opponents, who have not been affused or aspersed with water in the name of the Trinity, are still unbaptized—nor will they have complied with the divine injunction till they have received the ordinance in this scriptural manner.

The terms, '*circumstantial evidence*,' employed in

[1] C. R. p. 12. [2] Treatise, p. 26. [3] P. 67. [4] P. 411. [5] P. 318.

the present proposition, may be thought by some to concede a consciousness of invalidity in our argument. 'Give us,' say they, 'direct testimony in support of your practice and we will place confidence in the strength of your positions.' But, let it be remarked, that our opponents have adduced no direct evidence in maintenance of immersion—unless their mere assertions respecting the word baptize be of this description. Excepting these unfounded and gratuitous declarations, all the testimony they profess to bring is as much circumstantial as what we propose to lay before you. They have adduced no case from scripture, in which it is unequivocally said the baptized were absolutely put under water and taken out again in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. They simply infer that if a person is 'baptized in a place of much water, he must 'be plunged into it.'[1] They think it natural to suppose that the Eunuch was immersed, from the circumstances of the case;[2] but they have no direct proof for it. John's baptizing in Enon, because there was much water there, is the plainest instance they can exhibit in support of dipping; and yet this is allowed to be only a presumptive proof.[3] And so of every other case, and every other judicious opponent. The fact is, that no intelligent person, acquainted with the precise nature of this controversy, and supporting his respective opinion in a candid and feasible manner, can have recourse to any other species of argumentation. As there is no certainty obtainable, respecting the mode of this sacrament, but from the circumstances of its primitive administration, and as these, when fairly examined, will clearly settle the question at issue, we shall apply ourselves to these alone.

[1] Gill, p. 205. [2] Ibid. p. 213; Anderson, p. 10. [3] Gill, p. 210, 241.

But before we come to the more direct discussion of our subject, it will be proper to observe that we are not contending for a circumstantially precise and unvarying mode of baptism. We have defined our method to be 'pouring, 'sprinkling, or otherwise *applying the element to the can-* '*didate*,' in opposition to 'dipping, immersing, or otherwise '*applying the candidate to the element*'—modes as opposite to each other as light is opposed to darkness. We are not so supercilious as to argue that the water must be poured and not sprinkled, or sprinkled and not poured; or that some definite quantity must be used; or that it must be applied to some particular part of the body exclusively—because on these points the scriptures are unquestionably silent—and therefore it does not become us to be wise above what is written, nor to determine, respecting this or any other institution, what God has wisely and graciously left to the judgment or circumstances of his people. That the mode universally prevalent among our opponents is unscriptural, we conscientiously believe; and that the method generally regarded by Pedobaptists is true and complete, we are equally confident.

In prosecuting our future enquiries, we shall observe the following arrangement:—

I. *The contradictions and difficulties of our opponents.*
II. *The frequent application of the word baptize.*
III. *The mode of baptism among the Jews.*
IV. *Several instances of scripture baptism.*
V. *The numbers baptized by John and Christ's disciples.*
VI. *The baptism of the Holy Ghost.*
VII. *The numerous difficulties attending immersion.*
VIII. *The danger of dipping in many cases.*

SECTION FIRST.

THE CONTRADICTIONS AND DIFFICULTIES OF OUR OPPONENTS.

Although this particular has not a direct reference to the point at which we are aiming, yet it will indirectly aid our cause, by weakening that of our opponents, and by meeting an objection they have frequently brought against us. They would make us believe that their doctrine is so plainly established, and the evidence by which it is upheld so simple and tangible, that he who runs may read it, and that the way-faring man, though a fool, will easily arrive at their conclusions. They also affirm, that in supporting our system, there is so much difficulty, labour, management, and contradiction displayed, that people of ordinary capacities cannot comprehend our arguments; while superior minds must detect our sophistry, and should disentangle themselves from the ensnaring influence of our communion. The author of 'Antipedobaptism and Female Communion Consistent,' has the following remark:—'On what principle, honour-'able to Pedobaptism, and to the literary character of its de-'fenders, can any one account for the numerous inconsisten-'cies that subsist among themselves?'[1] 'Another objection,' 'says Mr. Gibbs, 'to the theory of infant baptism, is the 'contrariety of opinion which exists among those who yet 'most cordially espouse its general principles. This implies 'a deficiency of scripture evidence to guide their decisions, 'as well as a want of scriptural law to regulate their practice: 'nor is this an unfounded assertion; for though they all 'agree in the general conclusion, that infant baptism is

[1] P. 62.

'necessary, it is well known that they differ materially as 'to the premises from which they draw this conclusion; 'and that they flatly contradict each other as to many par- 'ticulars connected with this ceremony. So palpable is this 'difference of opinion in the history of the present contro- 'versy, that we frequently find the most expert and zealous 'defenders of Pedobaptism, not only admitting the great 'facts from which we reason, but strenuously opposing and 'laboriously disproving the principles laid down by some of 'their own party.'[1] This sentiment is frequently broached in the writings of the Baptists;[2] and it proceeds on the supposition that their system is free from similar inconsistencies, and their writers from those perplexities which they find or fancy amongst us. Now we think it may be easily perceived, from what we shall lay before you, that our brethren have also a vast many difficulties, and that the writings, issued in defence of their scheme, are pregnant with contradictions and contrivances—sufficient, indeed, to prove that their cause cannot be upheld without a great deal of trouble. Their laboured publications, some of which were not elicited by the attacks of Pedobaptists, display toil and research equal to any thing adduced against them, and develope contradictions unknown to our side of the question. A few specimens will place this assertion in a clear point of view.

I. Their contradictions respecting the word baptize.

1. They affirm, as you have heard, in the most positive language, that this term signifies always and only to dip or immerse a person or thing entirely.—Let them speak for themselves:—*Robinson:* 'To baptize is to dip.'[3]—*Gale:*

[1] P. 253. See Maclean, v. iii. p. 227.

[2] Booth, v. i. p. 226; vol. ii. p. 212-220, 487-512. [3] Hist. p. 132.

'I do not remember a passage where all other senses are 'not necessarily excluded besides dipping.[1] I have abun- 'dantly proved, from the Old Testament, that the significa- 'tion of the word is always to dip[2]—and only to dip.[3] It 'is as good sense to say a man is dipped when only a drop 'or two of water falls upon him, as to say he is baptized 'when he is sprinkled.[4] It is a mistake to suppose that 'words have more than one signification; and words and 'sentences are probably never to be understood but in their 'literal sense.'[5] — *D'Anvers:* '*Baptizo*, in plain English, 'is nothing but to dip, plunge, or cover all over.'[6] — *Pearce:* 'It may be asserted, that it is never used in the 'Bible to express any thing short of a total covering or uni- 'versal application.'[7] — *Jenkins:* 'We maintain that *bap- 'tizo* always signifies to dip the whole body.[8] In baptism, 'it is the act of immersion, not the quantity of water, that is 'contended for.'[9] — *Booth:* 'The word baptize in this 'dispute denotes an action required by divine law; and 'the simple question is, what is that action?'[10] — *Rees:* 'Immersion, I hope, does not consist in *wetting*, but in 'dipping.'[11]

11. They affirm, with equal plainness, that the term in question means other and opposite modes of action.— *Gale:* 'The word baptize, perhaps, does not so necessarily 'express the action of putting under water, as in general a 'thing being in that *condition*, no matter how it comes so, 'whether it is put into the water, or the water comes upon 'it.[12] We readily grant there may be such circumstances 'in some cases, which necessarily and manifestly show the

[1] P. 78. [2] P. 148. [3] P. 150. [4] P. 177. [5] P. 90.
[6] P. 182. [7] P. 16. [8] C. R. p. 56. [9] Def. p. 108. [10] V. iii. p. 265.
[11] P. 149. [12] P. 96.

'thing spoken of is not said to be dipped all over.'[1] — He acknowledges that in Ecclus. xxxiv. 25, it is used for *sprinkling* as well as bathing.[2] This is confirmed by Mr. Rees.[3] — *Ryland:* 'Almost all words, through the 'poverty of language, are used in different senses.'[4] He admits that Origen, referring to Elijah's wetting the wood, mentioned in the 1 Kings xviii. 32, 35, has employed the word for *pouring*.[5] — *Booth:* 'A person may, indeed, be 'so surrounded with subtle effluvia—a liquid may be so '*poured*—or it may so distil upon him—that he may be as 'if immersed!'[6] — *Anderson:* 'Baptism represents the 'effects of God's operation on the mind, rather than the 'way in which his agency is exerted.'[7] — *Jenkins:* 'Bap-'tism may fairly express the state of the disciples when 'overwhelmed with the Spirit, though the Spirit *fell* upon 'them.'[8] — *Keach:* 'Though the baptism of the Spirit was 'by *pouring* forth of the Spirit, yet they were overwhelmed 'or immersed with it; like as dust may be poured upon a 'dead corpse until it is covered all over or quite buried 'therein.[9] If you *pour* water on a child until it is covered 'all over in water, it may be truly said, that that child was 'buried in water,'[10] [or baptized.] — *Cox:* 'A person may 'indeed be immersed [that is, baptized] by means of *pour-'ing*, but immersion is being plunged into water or over-'whelmed by it.[11] The word baptize here (Dan. iv. 33) 'does not imply the manner in which the effect was pro-'duced, but the *effect* itself—not the mode by which the 'body of the king was wetted; but its *condition*, as result-'ing from its exposure to the dew of heaven. This is the

[1] P. 113, 114. [2] P. 119. [3] P. 120. [4] App. p. 19. [5] Ib. p. 15.
[6] V. 1. p. 97. [7] Intr. p. 36. [8] C. R. p. 22. [9] P. 4.
[10] P. 26. [11] P. 94.

'very idiom of all language; as we say he was burnt or 'drowned—the effect is simply expressed, without any re-'ference to the mode.'[1] The promise of Joel (ch. ii. 28, 29) 'refers to the whole of the communication and its results, 'and not to the mode of that communication.'[2]

On these citations few comments are requisite. The *action*, which is the entire topic of debate, is totally surrendered—therefore dipping is not essential to baptism. The word baptize is allowed to mean pouring and sprinkling, as well as immersing; and to express an effect produced or the condition in which a thing may be, no matter how it comes so. The parade about the quantity of water is absurd, since the word baptize, in this dispute, involves only the action, and not the nature or abundance of the baptizing element, as they repeatedly assure us; while the impropriety of employing the terms overwhelming and immersing as synonymous, must be apparent to all intelligent persons. In a word, the contradictions we have noticed are self-evident and of great importance. Hence, you perceive, that when our opponents are pressed, they yield up every position they desire to hold; and which surrender is, of course, fatal to their arguments.—'I cannot forbear observ-'ing,' says Mr. Booth, 'in the words of a great genius, "how happy it is to have to do with people that will talk "*pro* and *con!* By this means you furnished me with all "I wanted, which was to make you confute yourselves."[3]

II. Their contrivances for a decent and proper administration of baptism in the days of John and by the Saviour's disciples. We shall mention only three instances.

1. When the indelicacy of dipping the multitudes that came to John's baptism in the open air and in a large river

[1] P. 41. [2] P. 92. [3] Vol. ii. p. 511.

is objected to our opponents' scheme, they enquire, 'Is it 'incredible that in a country where tents were, there should 'be so great a number hearing John and no tents for refresh-'ment and rest? and if there were tents, why not some in 'which the men and others in which the women dressed 'and undressed?'[1] Their clothes in that climate were neither 'numerous nor burdensome.'[2]—A very comfortable contrivance, to be sure, narrated in the plainest terms by the evangelists and understood by our brethren without the use of those reprobated things—reasoning, inference, and analogy. Perhaps, after all, they had only the same kind of tents which the multitudes that followed Christ enjoyed, when they sat by hundreds and fifties in ranks or companies on the green grass, and took refreshment under the wide-spreading canopy of heaven. (See MATT. xiv. 19; xv. 35, 36—MARK vi. 40.)

11. When the difficulty of dipping with decency the three thousand baptized on the day of Pentecost is urged upon them, we are told, 'they might have been dipped in Be-'thesda, where the porches were so convenient for dressing 'and undressing:'[3] and, to lessen the labour of the twelve apostles, seventy auxiliary dippers are introduced—all at work at once in this said pool.[4] Passing over the assumptive character of this argument, we are to suppose that there were eighty-two people, old men and matrons, young men and maidens, dressing and undressing, with all possible despatch, at the same moment, in these five porches, or about sixteen in each. Whether the difficulty of the case is in any measure removed by this supposition, you are left to determine. We have no hesitation in saying it is not.—

[1] Jenkin's C. R. p. 60. [2] Ib. Def. p. 21. [3] Ib. C. R. p. 61.
[4] Ib. Def. p. 119. See J. Stennett, p. 123.

Further, this must have been a most unsuitable place for baptizing, if Dr. Hammond's notion be correct, and which our opponents can more easily deny than disprove. He says, 'the waters of this pool became medicinal by being 'impregnated with a healing warmth from the blood and 'entrails of the sacrificed beasts that were washed there.'[1] Nor is the opinion generally received much more favourable to the notion of our antagonists; which is, that 'the sheep 'were washed in this pool *before* they were offered in sa-'crifice:' by which it must have been rendered unfit 'for 'purification for religious purposes.'[2]—This unfitness will be still more palpable, if you consider that fair and pure water was essential to this ordinance among the ancient Christians.[3]

III. When the Jailor and his family were baptized, our brethren discover all requisite conveniences for the solemn occasion. They say, 'as there is a river spoken of (Acts 'xvi. 13) to which Lydia and others had resorted for 'prayer, no doubt there was a house by the river, in which 'their devotions were celebrated; and no place could be 'more convenient for the administration of baptism, by im-'mersion, than that river, with the convenience of that 'house.'[4]—Of this opinion, also, is Dr. Gill.[5]—So the Jailor took his poor prisoners, washed their stripes, and let them out of prison—of course under a strong escort—and then he took his wife and children out of their warm beds at midnight, and with second suits of clothes under their arms, away they all went through the streets, probably filled with people frightened by the earthquake (Acts xvi. 26),

[1] On John v. 4. [2] Calmet's Dict. Frag. No. LXVI.
[3] Rees, p. 126, 178; Gale, p. 113. [4] Jenkin's Def. p. 118.
[5] P. 461. See Ryland, p. 11.

till they came to the city-gate, which was soon unbolted, and out they passed and proceeded to the river (v. 13.) Then they went into this house, and shifted their dresses in the dark, or the turnkey held a light. Then Paul, or his companion, or both, walked into the water—then the Jailor came out and was plunged—then his wife followed and was plunged—and then came out their family and were plunged—the turnkey still holding his torch. Then they all went back into the house—took off their wet clothes, which they wrung, tied in bundles—wiped themselves dry—put on their usual apparel—returned to the city—entered the great gate—and soon reached the gaol. Then the Governor gave his prisoners some victuals—conducted them to their cell—and locked the door upon them. Then the Jailor and his family went to bed, and slept in peace. All this, on the principles of Drs. Jenkins and Gill, must have occurred in the space of an hour—and just in the order now enumerated.

III. Their polemical management and manœuverings. Under this head we shall comprehend several instances, which will prove that our opponents are not totally exempt from embarrassment while advocating their immersion-baptism.

1. When advantage may be taken of the blunders and unguarded expressions of Pedobaptists, they set to work with all their powers and persevering abilities—con over the dusty pages of numerous writers—extract a line or two here and a paragraph there, and then string them together in a book—and rise from the employment with the satisfaction and delight of a complete triumph. Of this, the works of Messrs. Keach, D'Anvers, and Booth, and a host of feeble imitators, are an abundant proof. But when we at-

tempt to strengthen our positions, by a similar process, our brethren, with much gravity assure us, ‘ that however great ‘ and honourable the patrons of a mistake may be, they are ‘ but men ; and the authority of Christ, and the respect and ‘ obedience we owe to his commandments, should counter- ‘ balance all other considerations.’ [1]

11. If a close and constant adherence to the letter of the Bible is thought prudent for carrying a point, we are told that ‘ the gospel alone is our rule of action[2]—that the New ‘ Testament must be the only rule by which we are to pro- ‘ ceed in our enquiries on this subject[3]—that we should ‘ have no other rule of faith and judge of controversies be- ‘ sides the sacred Word of God—for, if we admit any other, ‘ we directly give up our cause, and expose ourselves to all ‘ the impositions and inconveniences which are the insepa- ‘ rable attendants of popery[4]—that baptism is a positive ‘ rite. Analogy and presumptive reasoning may be used in ‘ matters that are not positive—but, as far as a duty is posi- ‘ tive, we must keep close to the letter of the law : analogy ‘ has nothing to do with it.[5] That their principle is as fol- ‘ lows :—A divine precept or an apostolical precedent is ‘ absolutely necessary to authorize the performance of any ‘ branch of ritual worship.[6] That if we once admit the in- ‘ ferential reasoning, with regard to positive institutes, which ‘ is legitimate when applied to moral duties, you open a ‘ door wide enough to admit all the mummeries of popery.[7] ‘ That analogical evidence, which can never amount to more ‘ than possible presumption, or mere probability, should ‘ not be admitted as authority in the worship of God—and

[1] Gale, p. 178. [2] Robinson, p. 574. [3] Dore’s Introd. p. 10.
[4] Gale, p. 189. [5] Jenkin’s Def. p. 22. [6] Booth, v. iii. p. 217.
[7] Cox, p. 111.

'that no ordinance should be recognized as divinely ap-'pointed upon any evidence short of demonstrative proof.'[1] But when the New Testament, understood in a literal sense, is brought against the positions of our opponents, they immediately alter their tone and mode of defence. Now 'it is 'impossible to reason without inference.'[2] 'The book' [of the Acts] says Mr. Robinson, 'is full of information, and, 'in regard to baptism, it informs us by what it does not say, 'as well as by what is reported.'[3] That is, we may infer many things from its silence. Dr. Gale, says, 'that to ap-'peal to the scriptures concerning the word baptize,' (which he tells us is the main branch of our dispute,[4]) 'and to be 'determined by them only in this question, is so unac-'countable a fancy, that I admire any gentleman of under-'standing should be guilty of it.'[5] In accordance with these declarations, they infer, suppose, analogize. They fancy that 'bathing was very common among the Jews'[6]—that there were tanks or cisterns of water fit for immersion in all Greek and Roman prisons,[7] and houses[8]—that people would not visit places where there was, in eastern language, much water, without dipping one another into it[9]—that the Eunuch had a large retinue of servants with him, and water sufficient for aspersion[10]—and innumerable other things of a similar character.

Here it may not be uninteresting to observe that our opponents differ respecting the validity of historical evidence:—one instance only shall be mentioned. Mr. Ivimy, the editor of the Baptist Magazine, says, in words already cited, 'admitting infant baptism to have existed, not only in the

[1] Gibbs, p. 317. [2] Jenkin's Def. p. 16. [3] Rob. p. 49.
[4] Gale, p. 73. [5] Ib. p. 147, 187. [6] J. Stennett, p. 123.
[7] Anderson's Introd. p. 37. [8] Jenkin's Def. p. 108.
[9] Anderson's Introd. p. 9. [10] Jenkin's Def. p. 119; Ryland, p. 11.

'first century, but even in the time of the apostles, unless it 'could also be *demonstrated* that it was practised by the 'apostles themselves, there could be no evidence produced 'that it was not a part of Antichrist, &c.'[1] Professor Anderson, says, 'the question between us lies not in the re-'gion of demonstration. If it [infant baptism] could be 'traced to the age of the apostles, as its advocates contend 'it may; I confess it seems to me, that it should be uni-'versally adopted.'[2] It is also amusing to remark that our opponents designate 'infant sprinkling one of the trumperies 'of the Church of Rome,' and seem disposed to give us a philippic for following the example of this communion. They however gravely adduce the ancient mode of dipping among the Papists, as good evidence in favour of their own particular practice.[3]

III. It is a maxim with our opponents, and it well deserves their devout consideration, that 'what proves too 'much, proves nothing at all.'[4] And to shew what would be the precise meaning of the word baptize, most consonant with their views and practice, they assure us that '*bap*-'*tizein* is of a middle signification, between *epipolazein*, to 'swim on the surface, and *dunein*, to sink to the bottom.'[5] And yet, whenever they can find a passage in which it is used for drowning a person, sinking a ship, putting into the water and raising no more, it is seized with avidity and adduced as indisputable evidence that the word baptize is employed only in a sense that favours their practice; as we have abundantly shown you from their own expressions. Whereas, according to the above maxim, these citations,

[1] Appendix to Gill, p. 48. [2] Introd. p. 19-96.
[3] New Evang. Mag. Compare Birt's Vind. p. 21, Dore's Pref. p. 17.
[4] Gale, p. 307. [5] Booth, v. i. p. 69.

by proving too much, prove just nothing at all. But the maxim would be equally correct if it run thus: 'What 'proves too little, proves nothing at all.' Hence when they prove that the word baptize means sometimes to dip, and infer that there is no baptism except by dipping, they prove too little and infer too much. In the like defective mode of reasoning, they establish the apostolic baptism of adults (which no Pedobaptist ever denied), and then infer that none but adults were the subjects of this ordinance. But this arguing is sophistical—as the deduction is vastly more extensive than the premises. The truth evidently is, that every passage cited from Greek writers, exhibits the word in dispute as expressing an action materially different from one person putting another just below the surface of the water, and instantly taking him up again. The original authors refer to actions either defective or redundant, performed by a different agency, or assuming a perfectly opposite character. In a word, the verb is never employed to express the whole act, and nothing but the act, of a modern immersion.

IV. When we find the term used to express other actions than dipping, as is often the case, they manage the topic most skilfully. If, for instance, it is employed for bathing a sword in slaughter, daubing the face with paint, colouring the cheeks by intoxication, dyeing a lake with the blood of a frog, beating a person till reddened with his own blood, staining the hand by squeezing a substance, ornamenting clothes with a print, needle, or brush, the tide overflowing the land, pouring water on wood and garden plants, overwhelming a ship with stones, oppressing the poor with taxes, and the like — we are told, that 'they

[1] Gale, p. 78, 106; Ryl. App. p. 3-13.

'were as it were dipped'[1] — or that 'the word is used in an 'allusive or metaphorical sense'[2] — or that the writers have employed 'hyperbolical' expressions, 'not literally true'— that something must be understood 'to qualify seeming ex- 'travagances of expression'[3] — that 'the passages are ob- 'scure, and can afford us no assistance'[4] — and that, notwithstanding all this, '*baptizo* means an action,[5] and always 'signifies to dip the whole body[6] — that it is a mistake, to suppose 'words have more than one signification—and that 'words and sentences are probably never to be understood 'but in their literal sense!'[7]

v. When they find that the word baptize is used to express unequivocally the descent of the element upon the object, though necessitated to give up the action, they endeavour to out-general us by having recourse to the quantity, which, however applied, places the person in a state of baptism. 'The king of Babylon,' for example, 'was as 'wet as if he had been dipped in a reservoir of dew, though 'it distilled in gentle drops upon him.'[8] Other illustrations of the kind have been mentioned before. And yet, as you have seen, when it serves their turn, or they feel pressed by the arguments of Pedobaptists, they assure us most positively 'that in baptism it is the *act* of immersion, and not 'the quantity, of water that is contended for.'[9] And that 'the word baptize in this dispute, denotes an *action* required 'by divine law, and that the simple question is, what is 'that action?'[10]

vi. Their reasonings on this subject are exceedingly curious; an instance or two will illustrate this declaration.

[1] Gale, p. 96. [2] Booth, vol. i. p. 97. [3] Gale, p. 79, 88.
[4] Ib. p. 104, 118, 147. [5] Booth, v. iii. p. 265. [6] Jenkin's C. R. p. 56.
[7] Gale, p. 90. [8] Cox, p. 41; Gale, 116-118. [9] Jenkin's Def. p. 108.
[10] Booth, *supra*.

'If the baptizer and the baptized, in the days of Christ and 'his disciples, went down both into the water, and the person 'baptized was dipped, then is baptism not sprinkling but 'dipping. But the baptizer and the baptized, in the days 'of Christ and his apostles, went down into the water, and 'the person baptized was dipped, *ergo*, baptism is not 'sprinkling but dipping.'[1] Here we have supposition, and assertion, and conclusion—and all this substituted for demonstrative evidence—and that, too, in an argument involving the main branch of our dispute. Of a similar character is the favourite doctrine of our brethren, 'that positive 'laws imply their negatives.'[2] For illustration, in Ps. lxxv. 6, we read that 'promotion cometh neither from the east, 'nor from the west, nor from the south,' *ergo*, promotion cometh from the north. When Christ says, 'he that be-'lieveth not shall be damned :' on the principle of our opponents, we must come to the unscriptural and horrible conclusion, that all who die in their infancy must be damned, because they cannot believe ! They also tell us, that 'what 'is not commanded by Christ, or practised by his apostles, 'is virtually forbidden as will-worship.'[3]—They also cite with approbation the saying of Tertullian—'the scripture 'forbids what it does not mention.'[4] But Christ did not render requisite, nor did the apostles ever use, baptistries, artificially constructed with pumps, pipes, and sewers; nor particular dresses with leads at the bottom for the baptized; nor prayer, nor psalm-singing at the font; nor deferring for an hour the baptism of an applicant; nor a dozen other things mentioned before and practised in modern dipping; *ergo*, all this is virtually forbidden as will worship.

[1] Keach, p. 20. [2] Booth, v. ii. p. 53. [3] Dore's Pref. p. 19.
[4] Booth, v. ii. p. 16.

It is very gravely asserted by the Rabbi of our opponents, that there is 'no proper washing but by dipping'—hence you can never wash your hands *properly* at a pump or shoot, nor your face by raising water up to it!—that 'there 'can be no dipping without washing'—so that you wash your pen whenever you dip it into the ink, and your shoe, if per accident you step into the mire!—that in the baptism of the Hebrews in the Red Sea, through which they walked as on dry land, 'there was a great resemblance of a person's 'being plunged under water'—consequently, if you walk between two neighbouring rivers, it is very like being plunged into them!—Lastly he remarks, that, 'in plunging 'a person, there is an application of the water to him, as 'well as an application of him to the water; for as soon as 'ever a person is plunged, the water will apply itself to 'him'[1]—therefore, as soon as any one applies a garment to his person, there is an application of his person to the garment: and if your enemy strike you on the head with his club, you may, according to Dr. Gill's logic, be said to apply your head to his bludgeon!

VII. The scriptural nature of dipping is urged, as unquestionable, from its greater solemnity than sprinkling. This is often reiterated in conversation, though seldom printed in their controversial writings. They regard this rite as requiring a sublime and devoutly-imposing aspect. We need hardly say, that this species of reasoning is a departure from their usual maxims, of a positive precept or an apostolical example. Overlooking other considerations, we may observe that this notion proceeds on the principle that the simplicity of a rite is one evidence against its divinity. What would our opponents have said to many of the services

[1] Gill, p. 223, 226, 229, 303.

among the Jewish people, and which all admit to have been of divine appointment?—Naaman, the Syrian, would have chimed in nicely with some of our Baptist brethren. He was wrathful because the prophet did not come out to him, and enjoin his doing some great thing for his recovery—a plain proof, by the way, that the General was not commanded to plunge himself under water seven times successively; for, had this been enjoined, it is more than possible he would have been satisfied with the magnitude of the means to be regarded. In following up the sentiment of our brethren, we must come to the conclusion, that the ceremonies of the English Episcopal and Roman Catholic churches have at least one good evidence in favour of their solemn and splendid worship. The rites of Christianity, according to the current opinion of our brethren in all other cases, derive proofs of their divinity from their simplicity; but here the case is reversed. However we enquire whether the baptism of a child or adult in our assemblies is not as seriously and solemnly performed as dipping a young lady into a baptistry or river, amidst the gazings of a hundred ungodly people, who attend for no other purpose in general than to enjoy the curious spectacle?

VIII. With respect to the design of baptism, our opponents express themselves very vaguely. To say nothing of baptism being, or not being, a term of Christian communion, respecting which, their denomination is split into two parts; nor of those other points of difference among the advocates of immersion, which are quite as numerous as those which divide Pedobaptist denominations—their system is evidently founded on the principle that baptism is designed chiefly, if not exclusively, to represent the *burial* of Christ. *Dr. Gill*, says, 'that baptism is not a sign or

'significative of the sprinkling of clean water, or the grace 'of the spirit in regeneration, or of the blood of Christ on 'the conscience of a sinner, all which ought to precede bap-'tism—but of the death, and burial, and resurrection of 'Christ.'[1] — Hence the stress laid on Rom. vi. 3-6, and Col. ii. 10-13, which we have already considered: and yet they assure us that it is also designed to represent purification or *washing*. — *D'Anvers* calls it 'a minister's 'washing a person—a sign to the believer of the covenant 'on God's part of washing away his sins by the blood of Christ.'[2] — *Burt*, says, baptism 'leads to the nature of 'sanctification, and offers an emblem of sanctification.'[3] — *S. Stennett*, calls it 'the type or emblem of the internal 'washing of regeneration.'[4] — *Maclean*, 'the washing away 'of sin, and the filth and pollution of sin.'[5] — *Booth*, calls it 'purification.'[6] — And *Ryland*, 'washing a person in 'much water, washing a person all over, and abundant pu-'rification.'[7] — *Gibbs*, 'they desire to be washed in the 'laver of baptism.'[8]

From these representations one would be led to conclude that to bury and to wash are synonymous terms—or, at least, in reference to this sacrament, properly interchangeable. But that they are not, we have no less authority than Dr. Cox, who says, 'It would be putting Mr. Ewing upon a 'most perplexing search to require him to produce any 'passage in Hebrew or Greek antiquity where washing 'means burying.'[9] Consequently these words cannot be fairly used to express the same act; and that if baptism is to represent a burial, it cannot represent washing. Indeed,

[1] P. 369. [2] P. 11, 20. [3] Letters, p. 24-26. [4] Part I. p. 33.
[5] Works, v. i. p. 132, 134. [6] Vol. i. p. 179. [7] P. 27, 34.
[8] P. 345. [9] P. 69.

Mr. Robinson says, 'that nothing but sophistry would make 'washing and baptism synonymous.'[1]

IX. Although our opponents can derange the order of scripture language, when they have an end to answer by it, as you have seen before;[2] yet it is plain that they build their system of baptizing only adults, or genuine believers in Christ, on the mere arrangement of words, as 'teach and 'baptize,' (MATT. xxviii. 19), or 'he that believeth and 'is baptized shall be saved,' (MARK xvi. 16), or 'they 'that gladly received the word were baptized' (ACTS ii. 41.)[3] We say nothing of the confession of the Eunuch (ACTS viii. 37), which is evidently a human interpolation,[4] and of course not pleadible by our brethren. But to show you that they can fairly lay no stress on this arrangement of terms, we will make a few references to scripture.

Mark i. 4.	John is said (1) to have baptized and (2) to have preached the baptism of repentance.
i. 15.	We are (1) to repent and (2) to believe the gospel.
xiv. 22.	The disciples (1) eat and (2) Christ gives them bread.
John i. 12.	They (1) received Christ and (2) had power to become the sons of God.
i. 52.	The angels, whose abode is in heaven, (1) ascended and (2) descended on the Son of Man.
iii. 5.	We must (1) be born of water and (2) of the Holy Spirit.
Acts ii. 38.	The murderers of Christ were (1) to repent and be baptized, and (2) to be forgiven and to receive the Holy Ghost.
Rom. ix. 10.	Confession (1) is made with the mouth and (2) belief is exercised with the heart.
2 Tim. i. 9.	We are (1) saved and (2) called.
Heb. xii. 22-24.	We come (1) to Mount Zion, the heavenly Jerusalem, to an innumerable company of angels, the general assembly of the saints, to God the Judge of all, to the spirits of just men made perfect, and (2) we come to Jesus, the Mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling.

[1] P. 36. [2] P. 181. [3] Keach's Pref. p. 11; Booth, vol. ii. p. 282.
[4] See Griesbach, Boothroyd, and A. Clarke, in Loc.

In all these passages, and in multitudes besides, the natural order of time, place, or action, is either inverted, or at variance with the hypothesis of our opponents. What stress, then, can they honestly and consistently lay on the arrangement of words in the institution before us—much less erect a prime and distinguishing doctrine of their denomination upon it? — After this refutation of the Baptists' argument, the following syllogism of Mr. Maclean may amuse you: — 'The supreme Lawgiver has expressly enjoined—first, to *make disciples*—then immediately to *baptize* the disciples—lastly, to *teach the baptized disciples* to observe, keep, or obey his laws or institutions. It must be admitted that church-fellowship and the Lord's supper fall under the last head; and if so, then, according to the order of the commission, men can no more be admitted to church-fellowship or the Lord's supper before baptism, than they can be admitted to baptism before they are made disciples.' — But from the words of Christ (MATT. xxviii. 20), we learn, that '*all things whatsoever* he had commanded' his disciples were to be taught the people, subsequent to their being discipled and baptized: and it must be equally admitted that holiness of life and zeal for God fall under the last head; and if so, then, according to the order of the commission, holiness and zeal can no more precede baptism, than church-fellowship or the Lord's supper. What a powerful argument against infant sprinkling!

x. It is a fundamental principle with our opponents in this discussion, though applied to no other, that 'analogy and presumptive reasoning may be used in matters that are not positive, but that as far as a duty is positive, we must keep close to the *letter* of the law—analogy having

'nothing to do with it.'[1] — Not to dilate on the groundless and absurd distinction of reasoning as to the *import* of moral duties, and not as to the *sense* of those which are positive, let us consider the present quotation:—We are to take all positive laws and declarations in their literal and grammatical sense without analogy or presumptive reasoning about them. Consequently our brethren, if evangelists, must 'provide neither gold, nor silver, nor brass, in their 'purses, nor script for their journey, neither two coats, 'neither shoes, nor yet staves (MATT. x. 9, 10), nor lay 'up treasure upon earth, nor care for the things of to-mor-'row (MATT. vi. 20, 34), nor invite their friends to a feast; 'but only the poor (LUKE xiv. 12), and, on no account, 'receive the appellation of Master (MATT. xxiii. 10.) Also when Christ says of the bread and wine used at the sacrament, 'This is my body, this is my blood (MATT. xxvi. '26, 28); and except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, 'ye have no life in you' (JOHN vi. 53), they must concede the palm to the Papists, and admit the doctrine of transubstantiation. When he says, 'preach the gospel to every creature,' we must understand it literally, and proclaim salvation to all the brutal tribes;—when he says, 'he that believeth 'and is baptized shall be saved,' we must conclude that Simon Magus is undoubtedly saved; for he believed and was baptized (ACTS viii. 13);—when he adds, 'these signs 'shall follow them that believe: in my name shall they cast 'out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall 'take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall 'not hurt them; they shall lay their hands on the sick, and 'they shall recover;' we must infer that every believer shall do this, for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it, (MARK

[1] Jenkin's Def. p. 22. See Booth, v. i. p. 82-89.

xvi. 15-18): and yet unless this absurd method of argumentation be rigidly maintained by our brethren, 'it is im-'possible for the Baptists to stand their ground by fair ar-'gument in various cases when disputing with Pedobaptists 'as such.'[1]

xi. Our opponents contend, as previously shewn,[2] that baptism is not only a positive law, but as specifically defined and settled as any of the Mosaic institutions. To the previous citations may be added Mr. Gibb's assertion: 'every thing is expressed with clearness, and nothing is 'left to the judgment or pleasure of the administrator.'[3] In answer to this position we beg to ask them a few questions.

1. Are the *persons* and characters of those who are *to administer* this rite as definitively prescribed as those of the priesthood under the legal dispensation?—Are the *subjects* of baptism as clearly and minutely described in the New Testament as the subjects of various ceremonies under the law?—Is the *mode* of baptism as expressly and particularly specified as the manner of consecrating the priests and Levites, cleansing a leper, purifying the ceremonially polluted, circumcising children, and worshipping God in the tabernacle or temple?

2. Was every part of the Hebrew ritual so plain and positive that nothing but wilful mistakes could occur, or that the smallest deviation from the established order vitiated the ceremony? If so, will our brethren take upon themselves to assert, that the case is precisely the same with respect to baptism? If not, the allusion by no means serves the cause of those who make it.

3. Can our opponents point out an instance where, through mistake, a wrong person officiated under the Levitical econo-

[1] Booth, *supra*. [2] P. 187. [3] P. 7.

my, or an improper subject was received, or an invalid mode of operation adopted? If not, can they not find improper ministers officiating in this sacrament in Judas and Demas? and, omitting the mode as the point to be investigated, can they find no instances where, according to their ideas of proper subjects, unsuitable characters were baptized even by the harbinger of Christ and his apostles? Was Simon Magus a fit subject? Was Judas Iscariot? Were those disciples who went back and walked no more with Christ? Were all the inhabitants of Jerusalem, Judea, and the region round about Jordan, baptized by John or the twelve disciples, not one of a thousand of whom was truly converted to God, (as their conduct towards Christ while before Pilate, and towards the apostles of our Lord afterward, and as the judgments denounced and brought upon them for their iniquity, place beyond the possibility of debate;) we ask, were these, in the esteem of our brethren, proper subjects of baptism; that is, 'in a state of salvation' or rege-'nerated and brought into the covenant of grace?'[2] If not, were they known to be unconverted when baptized, or were they baptized by mistake? Let our brethren choose which side they please. In either case they must sacrifice their position or yield their cause respecting the subject.

Dr. Gill, though flatly contradicted by Mr. Gibbs, tells us, 'that admission to baptism lies *solely* in the breast of the 'administrator, who is the only judge of qualifications for 'it, and has the sole power of receiving to it and of rejecting 'from it.'[3] But is it not notorious that among the ministers of the Baptist donomination there are immense grades of knowledge, acumen, and piety? Is each, then, to judge of character according to his own quantum of biblical infor-

[1] J. Stennett, p. 48. [2] Gibbs, p. 32. [3] Body of Div. v. iii. b. 8.

mation and discernment of men? If so, will they not determine differently — one admitting to baptism those another would reject? In fact, if what they call believers' baptism be held as exclusively scriptural—difficulties numerous and immense must ever encompass the sacrament in question.

XII. Our opponents retort, and say that unless we understand the positive divine law of baptism in its primary, grammatical, and literal sense, it is impossible for Protestants to debate succesfully with Papists, or Dissenters with Churchmen.[1] In reply, we say that this is a palpable mistake: for, as you have heard before, transubstantiation, one of the chief and most objectionable dogmas of popery, is advocated exclusively by the mode of interpretation here adopted in support of believers' baptism—understanding the sacred text in its literal and grammatical sense. Extreme unction also stands in the same situation; and all Protestants are induced to combat these absurd sentiments by reasoning, analogy, and inference. Nor is it requisite that Dissenters should have recourse to the contracted measures adopted by our brethren to maintain the great principles of nonconformity. If an open, candid, and consistent, interpretation of the holy oracles, will not support their secession, they can have but little fair and tenable ground on which to erect the great and glorious cause of dissent. Between 'keeping close to the letter of the law,' and a vague latitudinarian application of biblical expressions, there is a wide intervening space, which the honest and intelligent expounder of the sacred scriptures will not fail to occupy:— on this, we feel no hesitation in saying, the ingenuous Pedobaptist takes his stand; and on this arena he feels a pleasure in joining issue with his Baptist opponents.—We will

[1] Booth, v. ii. p. 470-472; Ryland's Append. p. 22.

conclude this section on the difficulties and contradictions of the Baptists in the language of one of their recent apologists:—'By ascribing to the holy scriptures a rite which is 'evidently of human invention, which involves so much 'perplexity and contradiction in the mode of defending it, 'and which, by being carried into general practice, is pro-'ductive of results so palpably repugnant to every idea 'which reason itself dictates as consistent with a divine 'constitution of things among men; they virtually impute 'to the Christian revelation an imperfection of character 'which has furnished the infidels of our age with some of 'their most powerful objections against its claims to a di-'vine origin.'[1]

SECTION SECOND.

THE FREQUENT APPLICATION OF THE WORD BAPTIZE.

From what has been previously advanced respecting the import of the word baptize, it might be thought needless to enter further into the discussion. It should, however, be observed, that the foregoing considerations were designed to prove merely that its applications were various and opposite. Our present intention is to convince you that it is frequently used in a sense perfectly consistent with our mode of administering this sacrament—by applying the element to the object in the shape of pouring, sprinkling, staining, and the like. Though in this particular we shall be led to travel over a considerable portion of our former dissertation on the verb baptize, the importance of the present discussion

[1] Gibbs, p. 242, 243.

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

is an ample apology. To have before our eyes a number of passages from various authors, supporting our positions, must be deemed of no trivial influence in our calculations.

It, however, is proper to remind you, that the scriptural mode of baptism cannot be determined simply by the use of this word. After what has been said, it must strike the dullest apprehension, that a term of such vague and general import, can never of itself settle a question which has been so long and so ably litigated by contending parties. The circumstances of the New Testament baptisms must be carefully examined; and conclusions drawn from them fairly and ingenuously. By this means, one may arrive at the truth; and, in the exercise of an unprejudiced spirit, settle the dispute. To prove that the use of the word baptize perfectly harmonizes with our scheme is the design of the ensuing remarks, we shall refer you, first, to Greek writers in general—secondly, to the Septuagint and Apocrypha—and, thirdly, to certain texts in the New Testament; being as concise as the subject will admit.

I. THE GREEK WRITERS IN GENERAL.

1. *Aristophanes.*—'Magnes, an old comic of Athens, 'used the Lydian music, shaved his face, and baptized it 'with tawny colours.'[1] He applied the colours to his face. '—Dress not with costly clothes which are baptized with 'the richest colours.'[2] Several colours must be applied to the cloth.—'Lest I baptize you with a Sardinian dye.'[3]—'Lest I beat you till I make you red with blood.'[4] Here the colouring element is applied to the body.

11. *Aristotle.*—'The Phenicians, who inhabit Cadiz, 'relate that, sailing beyond Hercules' Pillars, in four days

[1] Gale, p. 86. [2] Ib. p. 84. [3] Cox, p. 45. [4] Ibid.

'with the wind at east, they came to a land uninhabited, 'whose coast was full of sea-weeds, and it is not baptized 'at ebb—but when the tide comes in, it is wholly covered 'and overwhelmed.'[1] Here, as Dr. Gale remarks, the word is 'used to signify the land was under water, by the water 'coming *upon* it, and not by its being put into the water.'[2]— 'If it is pressed, it baptizes the hand which sustains and 'presses it.'[3] Here the hand is tinged by an application of the colouring matter to it.

III. *Dion. Cassius.*—'Those from above baptizing the 'ships with stones and engines.'[4] Here the baptizing materials came from above down upon the vessels.

IV. *Homer.*—'He, the frog, breathless fell, and the lake 'was baptized with blood.'[5] The blood was applied to the water, and not the water dipped into the blood.

V. *Josephus.*—'When a person was defiled by a 'dead body, they put a little of these ashes into spring 'water with hyssop, and baptizing part of the ashes with it 'they sprinkle them—and they are clean.'[6] That the water was poured on the ashes is plain, from NUMB. xix. 17: 'They shall take of the ashes of the burnt heifer, and run- 'ning water shall be put thereto in a vessel.'

VI. *Libanus.*—'He who bears with difficulty the bur- 'den he already has, would be entirely baptized by a small 'addition.'[7] Here a person is baptized, not by dipping him into evil, but by the burden on his back.

VII. *Origen.*—'How came you to think that Elias, when 'he should come, would baptize; who did not in Ahab's 'time baptize the wood upon the altar, which was to be 'washed before it was burnt, by the Lord's appearing in

[1] Gale, p. 96. [2] Ibid. [3] Ibid. 86. [4] Ryland's App. p. 12.
[5] Cox, p. 46. [6] Ryland's App. p. 9. [7] Cox, p. 45.

'fire. But he orders the priest to do that, not only once, 'but says, do it a second time, and they did it a second time, 'and do it the third time, and they did it the third time. 'He, therefore, that did not himself baptize then, but as-'signed that work to others, how was he likely to baptize, 'when he, according to Malachi's prophecy, should come?' That the word is here used four times for pouring, may be seen by referring to 1 KINGS xviii. 32-35: 'Fill four bar-'rels with water, and pour it on the burnt sacrifice and on 'the wood.'—This Dr. Ryland admits;[1] but tries to evade the action, by enlarging on the quantity; and here, by the bye, Origen designates John's baptism pouring—and nothing else.

VIII. *Plutarch.*—'As plants thrive and flourish when 'they are moderately watered, but wither and pine away 'if you drench them too much; so the mind, if moderately 'exercised with labours proportionable to its abilities, grows 'more vigorous; but too much toil baptizes it.'[2] Here young persons are baptized by too much toil—as plants are often drenched by pouring too much water upon them. The act is indisputable—the quantity is foreign to our investigation.

IX. *Ælian.*—'Having baptized with precious ointment 'a garland woven of roses.'[3] The garland was surely not dipped into a box of ointment, but the ointment was poured or sprinkled on the garland.

X. *Athenæus.*—'I have been baptized with wine.'[4] Not bathing in it, but intoxicated—the wine was applied to him, for he drank it.

XI. *Bentley's Epigrams.*—'You baptize your head, but

[1] Ryland's App. p. 15. [2] Gale, p. 102. [3] Ewing, p. 248.
[4] Ibid, p. 44.

'you shall never baptize old age.'[1] You adorn your head with gay attire, but cannot renew your youth. Here the baptizing material is applied to the head.—'Who first bap-'tized the muse with viperish gall?'[2] Who first tinged or imbued the mind by applying the element to it?—'Some 'people, O Nycilla, say that you baptize your hair, which 'you bought completely black out of the market.'[3] They say you dye your hair while on your head, which was done by staining it black—not by dipping it into the colouring ingredients.

XII. *Iamblichus.*—'Baptize not in the periranterion.'[4] This was a small vessel like those kept at the doors of Roman Catholic chapels[5]—the act here is evidently sprinkling.

XIII. *Julius Pollux.*—'The girl observing the mouth of 'the dog (which had eaten the murex) stained with an un-'usual baptism.'[6] The murex is a small shell-fish. The mouth of the dog was baptized by an application of the colour to it.

XIV. *Justin.*—'Sprinkling with holy water was invented 'by demons in imitation of the true baptism, signified 'by the prophets (Is. lii. 15; EZEK. xxxvi. 25), that 'their votaries might have their pretended purifications by 'water.'[7] Here sprinkling and baptism are used synonymously.[8]

XV. *Potter's Antiq.*—'The priests of Cotys were called 'Baptists from staining their bodies with certain colours.'[9] Here, also, the colouring element is applied to the body.

XVI. *Suidas.*—'Being carried before a tribunal, he was 'scourged by the executioners, and, flowing with blood,

[1] Ewing, p. 253. [2] Ibid. [3] Ibid. [4] Ib. 248.
[5] Potter's Ant. vol. i. p. 224. Ed. 1824. [6] Ewing, p. 247.
[7] Taylor's Lett. p. 63. [8] Booth, v. iii. p. 250. [9] V. i. p. 469.

'baptized the hollow of his hand.'[1] That is, some of the flowing blood fell into the hollow of his hand, and thus baptized it.

These passages are sufficient as specimens of a great many more. In all of them the word baptize is used for pouring, sprinkling, or otherwise applying the element to the subject. Consequently we do no violence to the current sense of the verb, when we designate an application of water in this sacrament 'A Baptism;' and this is all we are now aiming to establish.

II. THE SEPTUAGINT AND APOCRYPHA.

Here we beg to premise, that as every text in which the word under consideration occurs in these books has been briefly noticed already, and as several of them will claim our attention hereafter, we shall cite no more than will establish our position;—that the term baptizing may be properly used for pouring, sprinkling, or applying, in contradistinction from dipping or submersing. The cases we shall select will show its various actions—in giving a colour, purifying, overwhelming, and wetting. Having also shown that the prepositions connected with the verb may be fairly construed according to the supposed action intended, we shall, as before, render them in consonance with the apparent design of the original writers. For this, also, we have the sanction of our opponents' practice.

1. JUDGES v. 30.—'To Sisera a prey of baptized [attire], 'a prey of baptized [attire] of needle-work on both sides.' Here the garment is baptized by the needle, the colours being applied to the cloth. Josephus uses the word in a similar sense: 'A girdle embroidered with the same bap-

[1] Ewing, p. 254.

'tisms and flowers as the former, with a mixture of gold 'interwoven.'[1] The former he describes as 'embroidered 'with flowers of scarlet and purple and fine-twined linen.'[2] (See Exod. xxxix. 5.) The method was unquestionably by applying the colours to the cloth, as in modern tapistry.[3] Should it be supposed that an allusion is here made to dyeing, it could be only to such a process as lays the colouring ingredients on the cloth by carved prints or brushes, and which practice is still common in our own country, and absolutely necessary in producing variegated apparel. This in fact was the primitive mode of dyeing; and clearly developes the actions of the verbs *baptizo* and *tingo* when employed in reference to this operation. President Goguet, in his 'Origin of Laws, Arts, and Sciences, &c.' tells us, that the origin of dyeing consisted in pressing the juices of various herbs and fruits on the cloth, or by staining it with certain earths of different colours.

II. 2 Kings v. 10, 14.—'And Elisha sent a message to 'Naaman, saying, Go and wash at Jordan seven times. 'Then went he down and baptized himself seven times at 'Jordan.' Here remark the Syrian General was commanded only to wash, which may be done in various modes,[4] and that not all over, but only the place affected (v. 11.) That nothing great was enjoined, we learn from his servants (v. 13); consequently seven plungings in Jordan were not enforced; and that the Jewish mode of cleansing a leper was commanded, we may gather from the piety of the prophet, and the number of applications of water to the unclean. The divine precept runs thus: 'And he shall 'sprinkle upon him that is to be cleansed from the leprosy

[1] Ant. lib. iii. ch. 7. s. 4. [2] Ib. s. 2. [3] See Shaw's Travels, p. 228.
[4] Maclean, vol. iii. p. 118.

'seven times, and shall pronounce him clean' (Lev. xiv. 17.) That this haughty and indignant soldier did no more than was inculcated by the man of God, we may conclude from the state of his mind and his unwillingness then to do any thing. That he stripped and dived seven times from the bank of the river, when only told *to wash*, bathe, or wet the place diseased, may be easily conceived. We have here then clear circumstantial evidence for the use of the word baptize in the sense of applying the water to the person in the shape of an aspersion.

III. Isaiah xxi. 4.—'My heart panted: fearfulness bap-'tized me.' This language is predictive of the calamities which befel the impious king of Babylon; and the accomplishment of it is recorded by the sacred historian: 'In the 'same hour came forth fingers of a man's hand, and wrote 'over against the candlestick upon the plaister of the king's 'palace: and the king saw the part of the hand that wrote. 'Then the king's countenance was changed, and his thoughts 'troubled him, so that the joints of his loins were loosed, 'and his knees smote one against another. In that night was 'the king of the Chaldeans slain,' (Dan. v. 5, 6, 30.) Although the verb here expresses principally the effects produced on this wicked monarch, yet, as far as the cause is seen and the action discoverable, our position is firmly supported. He was overwhelmed by the ominous phenomenon on the wall, and died by the strokes of the sword —probably bathed in his own royal blood.[1] The vision appeared *to him*, and the murderous weapons of war were applied *to him* by the soldiers of Cyrus. In neither instance was there any action analogous to dipping him in a reservoir of water—all his calamities came upon him.

[1] Rollin's Anc. Hist. b. iv. ch. 1, s. 2.

iv. Dan. iv. 33.—'And his body was baptized with 'the dew of heaven.' (See also chap. v. 21.) That the ex-monarch of Babylon was baptized by the dew falling upon him, throughout the night in the open field, no one presumes to question. The quibbles of our opponents respecting the probable quantity,[1] by no means affects the case, unless they are prepared to give up the action or mode of dipping, and at once concede that a copious shower-bath will answer every end of modern immersion. The dispute, as far as the word is concerned, embraces only the action. Hence they assure us, that, 'in baptism, it is the 'act of immersion, and not the quantity of water, that is 'contended for;'[2] and that 'the word baptize, in this 'dispute, denotes an action required by divine law; and 'the simple question is, what is that action?'[3] Why, here most unquestionably, applying the element to the object in the form of sprinkling!

v. Judith xii. 7.—'She went out in the night into the 'valley of Bethulia, and was baptized at a fountain of water 'in the camp.' The expression here, '*epi tes peges*,' rendered '*at a fountain*,' is the same as that in John iv. 6, '*epi te pege*,' being wearied with his journey, sat thus '*on* '*the well*'—not in it. It appears that there was only one fountain in this valley—that an army of more than 200,000 men lay encamped about it—that such an important source of existence would be guarded with the utmost vigilance (chap. vii. 2, 3, 27; viii. 9)—that Judith was a woman of great rank and beauty—and that her sole object was a ceremonial purification. So far our object is plain. Let our opponents then imagine, that this lady, either naked or attired, should plunge herself over head and ears into this

[1] Gibbs, p. 66. [2] Jenkin's Def. p. 108. [3] Booth, v. iii. p. 265.

fountain of water, or that her waiting women (ch. viii. 32) should do it by her. No such kind of purification was known under the law, nor any where required by the divine Legislator. If she had pure water sprinkled on her by a clean companion, she would have fulfilled all the scriptures required—and this was undoubtedly done.

VI. ECCLUS. XXXIV. 25.—'He that baptizeth himself 'because of a dead body, and toucheth it again, what 'availeth his washing?' To understand the precise action involved in the word in this place, reference must be made to NUMB. XIX. 19, where the method of such a purification is specifically defined: 'And the clean person shall sprinkle 'upon the unclean on the third day and on the seventh 'day; and on the seventh day he [the clean person] shall 'purify himself, and wash his clothes, and bathe himself in 'water, and shall be clean at even.' It further appears from v. 20, that if the water of separation were sprinkled upon a person, he was perfectly clean—nothing more was to be done to him nor by him; and from v. 21, that it was to be a perpetual statute, that he who sprinkled or touched the water of separation was unclean, and must wash both his clothes and himself. From this we gather that the person defiled was cleansed entirely by sprinkling, and that the purifier, becoming unclean by performing this rite, was to wash himself and his clothes for purification—this being the only resource left him. Josephus speaks of purifying the house and its inhabitants after a funeral, as if both were performed in the same way;[1] but as the house was not dipped, we have no reason to conclude that the people were; and as that was sprinkled, we infer they underwent only a similar lustration. Our opponents, indeed, admit,

[1] Contra Apion, b. ii. s. 27.

that sprinkling formed part of the baptism;' but a slight inspection of the case shows that this, in fact, was the whole of it.

III. THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Here a very few references will prove that the word baptize is sometimes employed to express such modes or actions as are consonant with our method of baptizing, by sprinkling or pouring, or applying the element to the object. This is all we have at present in view. We shall begin with the passage selected as the basis of these discourses.

1. MATT. iii. 11.—'I, indeed, baptize you with water—'he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire.' To understand the import of this word, in the former clause of the sentence, we must enquire into its application in the latter. This is easily done—for the baptism of the Holy Ghost, as witnessed on the day of Pentecost, at Cæsarea, as expressed invariably in the Old and New Testament, and as conceded in numerous places by our opponents, was always, by descending upon, or by an application unto, the person baptized. Now, unless John baptized his converts and followers by pouring, sprinkling, or applying water, he has employed the verb in a most unaccountable manner, giving it two directly opposite senses in the same verse—pouring upon the person and plunging him into the water. But as this cannot be imagined, we have not only the most conclusive proof of its meaning to pour, sprinkle, or apply the element to the object, in one part of the verse—but if John were not the most inconsistent speaker in the world, of pouring, sprinkling, or applying the element to the object in both. And thus our antagonists would reason in other

[1] Gale, p. 119; Rees, p. 120.

similar cases, and that necessarily. For example, the word *aion* is twice used in MATT. xxv. 46, to express the duration of future happiness and misery. Here the eternity of punishment is always argued from the fact, that the word in both cases must mean alike—eternal felicity being universally assumed.

11. MARK vii. 4, 8.—'And when they come from the 'market, except they baptize, they eat not. And many other 'things there be which they have received to hold, as the 'baptizing of cups and pots, brazen vessels and tables,' or couches. Now, had the natural purification of cups and pots been only intended, we could easily perceive how it might have been done by dipping them. But that brazen vessels used for cooking food over a fire, some of them very cumbersome and weighty, like modern copper kettles and boilers, should be submersed for cleansing, is what we cannot so easily fancy—especially if we consider the scarcity of water in Jerusalem. Much less can it be supposed that their tables, calculated to accommodate large parties, were washed by dipping them into water. And, if the word *cline*, as D'Anvers affirms, 'never signifies a table, but a bed,'[1] on which several persons reclined together at meals, after the eastern fashion—the case becomes still more improbable, even amounting to a practicable impossibility. It should, however, be remembered, that the word baptize is here employed for a ceremonial purification only, which, as you have seen before, required only an aspersion or affusion. We have, then, another instance in our favour. That the Pharisees and all the Jews, whenever they came from the market, and before they ate, should plunge themselves over head and ears in water, is what few will believe. Though

[1] P. 205.

they might have washed themselves from head to feet, like the superstitious Kemmouts,[1] by applying the water to the body, the action, which is the only point in debate, would be exclusively in our favour. Our opponents, indeed, find this passage rather puzzling. Hence, Dr. Gale would render it, 'what they buy in the market, unless *it* be washed 'they eat not.'[2] But this does not solve the difficulty—for though vegetables might bear a dipping under water, we presume this mode was not adopted with flour, honey, milk, oil, &c. which were all marketable articles. Even the Dr. himself admits, that 'to talk of dipping a thing that is 'not capable of being dipped, is nonsense.'[3]

III. 1 Cor. x. 2.—'And were all baptized unto Moses 'in the cloud and in the sea.' This, our opponents tell us, was 'a type of gospel baptism;'[4] or that Christian baptism is like that administered in the Red Sea. How that was done we can have little difficulty in determining. There is the most positive evidence that the children of Israel were neither dipped nor plunged, wholly nor partially, into Moses or the water. They went through the midst of the sea on dry land. Our opponents presume to assert that 'the 'Israelites were surrounded by the water, covered above by 'the cloud, and yet on dry land.'[5] This is very unlike the baptism of our brethren, being deficient in the main point of dispute, namely, the action of dipping; for, as Maclean observes, 'here was no action performed by one man upon 'another, as our Lord enjoins—nor was there a close con-'tact of the water with their bodies.'[6] If the Hebrews were baptized by water at all, it was by an aspersion, as we learn

[1] Calmet's Dict. Frag. No. 32. [2] P. 138. See Gill, p. 252.
[3] Gale, p. 91. [4] Keach's Met. p. 184. [5] Jenkin's Def. p. 54.
[6] Vol. iii. p. 188

from Ps. lxxvii. 16, 17: 'The depths also were troubled, 'the clouds poured forth water, the skies, also, sent out a 'sound.' Mr. Wilson, in his Scripture Manual, says, 'the 'term *baptized*, must refer to their SITUATION in the *midst* 'of the sea.'[1] Hence if their's was not a dry baptism, it was like Nebuchadnezzar's—by a copious sprinkling—the action being exclusively on our side. One is rather amused at Dr. Gill's remark, where he says, 'there was a very great 'resemblance [in this instance] of a person's being bap-'tized or plunged under water.'[2]

IV. REV. xix. 13.—'And he was clothed in a vesture 'baptized with blood, and his name is called the Word of 'God.' This passage may be illustrated by another referring to the same glorious person in similar circumstances: 'And 'their blood shall be sprinkled upon my garments and I 'will stain all my raiment,' (Is. lxiii. 3.) The Son of God is represented as clothed in a garment not dyed in a vat of human gore—but as splashed with the blood of his expiring enemies. To suppose this passage refers to the scarlet robes worn by Roman generals,[3] destroys the energy of the enraptured speaker. Besides, were the Jews thus arrayed? Or was the Roman *toga* coloured with blood? Or for what purpose could the robe be said to be stained with blood if it were not that of his enemies? Was it the blood of his friends? Dr. Gale says, 'St. John represents the person in 'this vision to have been clothed with a vesture which was 'dipped, or as it were dipped, in the blood of his enemies. 'Origen cites these words from v. 11 to v. 16, inclusively, 'almost verbatim, as they are in our editions, but reads *er-'rhantismenon*, sprinkled, instead of *bebammenon*, dipped.'[4] This is important, for it shews that this learned father con-

[1] P. 20. [2] P. 226. [3] Cox, p. 39. [4] P. 149.

sidered the words as synonymous and properly interchangeable. Mr. Walker, in his 'Doctrine of Baptisms,' observes that 'Montanus and Beza render the word by *tinctum* or '*tincta*, meaning to dye or stain, as doth, also, the Arabic 'version. The Latin, Vulgate, Æthiopic, and Syriac, by 'aspersion or conspersion, to sprinkle or besprinkle with 'blood.'[1] Here, then, is another instance where the word baptize is employed to express the action of sprinkling or pouring, or the application of the element to the object, and not of the object to the element.

IV. OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.

We have now adduced sufficient specimens of the use of the word for pouring or sprinkling, or applying the element to the object, to prove that no violence is done to the term when we designate our mode of administering this sacrament a baptism. For though, as we have repeatedly asserted, the verb under review in general expresses an effect, or condition rather than an operation, what we have advanced must have convinced you, that this effect or condition is produced by sprinkling or pouring, as well as by an immersion. This point we shall consider as irrefragably established. There are, however, two or three objections which we shall anticipate and repel.

1. Our opponents argue that the verbs *bapto* and *rhantizo* are sometimes used in such connexions, and under such circumstances in the Septuagint, as to prove that they are of different, if not of opposite, applications. We do not for a moment hesitate to concede this point to our antagonists, though we are far from supposing our position affected by the concession. That *bapto* and *rhantizo* are frequently

[1] P. 19, 20.

used *synonymously*, has been rendered unquestionable; but the former term, being of a more diversified application than the latter, includes other actions besides affusion and aspersion, as we have repeatedly observed. Hence in some connexions it means to dip, dye, drown, sink, &c.—in others to paint, stain, pour, sprinkle, &c. The sense of it, in the passages referred to, is simply TO WET, so as to admit of a subsequent aspersion; and, like this vernacular verb, includes a variety of actions:—as a person may be wetted by going into a bath, or by being out in a shower. As we wet an article by dipping or sprinkling it, so a thing may be baptized either by plunging or affusion. To ground the practice of submersion or aspersion on the mere sense of the term, would be fallacious. Regard it as synonymous with the verbs to wet, wash, colour, cleanse, or consecrate, which may be effected by various modes of action, and every difficulty vanishes—the application of it by the Greek translators of the Pentateuch is justified, and the objection of our opponents falls to the ground.

11. Again they argue, 'If your deductions are correct, we are left in a state of utter uncertainty respecting the precise import of words altogether, and of what God would have us to do in this institution.'[1]—To which we reply, 1. That this is not always nor often the case with respect to language—the import of specific terms being generally manifest in all connexions; but where words are generic, expressive of action indefinitely, or which primarily denote an effect or condition, the mode of operation being unimportant, is often obscure, and can be learned only from analogy or inference, and sometimes not at all.—2. That this objection applies as much to our opponents as to ourselves.

[1] See Booth, v. i. p. 84, 85; Rob. p. 36; Gibbs, p. 58-61.

We have shown, from their writings, in a manner we hope quite satisfactory, that the terms in question, both verbs and prepositions, are of diverse significations, or are used in connexions where they necessarily exhibit different and opposite actions, and a great variety of effects—so that the objection recoils with all its force upon the objectors.—3. That if our opponents can base their immersion system on nothing more wide or stable than a definite use of general terms, it can never stand the test of examination. That this is the case with the scheme of our brethren, will be palpable to those who have attended to the foregoing observations, and who have witnessed their aversion to any philological investigation of the grounds of their practice.

III. They may object further, 'If your positions be correct, your mode of baptism by sprinkling, pouring, or applying the element to the object, cannot be established as exclusively scriptural any more than dipping.' We answer, without hesitation, that it can; and that from evidence infinitely preferable to a reliance on vague and indefinite verbs and mutable prepositions—we mean from circumstantial evidence, which is the best, not only in courts of law, but even in the historical facts of the gospel. Nor let it be supposed that this is a species of testimony of which our brethren never avail themselves. They have no other for observing the first day of the week instead of the seventh—for admitting females to the Lord's table—for the perpetuity of the sacraments—and indeed for most other ordinances among them: and to see that they joyfully avail themselves of it, when presenting the least semblance of argument in their favour, you have only to refer to their reiterated allusions to the baptism of John at Jordan and Enon, and of Philip and the Eunuch in the desert. Of

course they can never consistently object to a similar species of evidence from us, when so common in their own communion. We have proved that the terms of the institution and the narratives of its first administration by no means establish the mode of our opponents; and that the cases they have cited, as most in their favour, are as relevant to our method as to their own. We have, in fact, completely overthrown their exclusive scheme of baptism; and disposed of every material argument they have advanced in support of it. Having thus cleared the ground of every plausible objection, we shall now, from circumstantial evidence of the most conclusive character, prove to you, that sprinkling, pouring, or applying water to the baptized, was the only primitive mode, and such as alone is valid in our age and country. We say sprinkling, pouring, or applying the water to the baptized; for, as previously observed, we are not contending about minute and frivolous regulations on which the scriptures are silent. If the general features of the administration accord with the revealed will of God—or, in other words, if the element be applied to the person, and not the person to the element, we are satisfied.

SECTION THIRD.

THE MODE OF BAPTISM AMONG THE JEWS.

That rites and ceremonies designated baptism were common among the Jews, may be inferred from the preceding observations. The cases of Naaman, Judith, Nebuchadnezzar, the Israelites in the Red Sea, and of the Levitical purifications, which are repeatedly designated baptisms, are

indisputable. From the frequent ablutions among at least a part of the chosen tribes, before our Saviour's incarnation, the Jews were called Hemero, or Daily Baptists.[1] It is contended, also, that one rite in the admission of proselytes to a participation of Hebrew privileges, was by baptism.[2] Dr. Gill remarks, that 'there were divers bathings, *baptisms*, 'incumbent on the Israelites, and so upon such proselytes 'who were upon an equal footing with them, and equally 'under obligation to obey the ceremonial law — which con-'sisted of divers washings, *baptisms*.'[3] Dr. Gale also says, 'that the Jews, on account of several kinds of pollution, 'used to purify themselves by washing, cannot be questioned; 'the divers washings [Greek *baptisms*] mentioned in the 'Epistle to the Hebrews, (c. ix. 10,) make it incontesti-'ble.'[4] 'Therefore, it appears with superior evidence, from 'the testimony of these competent and unexceptionable 'witnesses, that baptism was well known, as a ceremonial, 'purifying rite, prior to the Christian era.'[5] A particular consideration of those ceremonies, thus designated baptism, by persons who designed to be fully understood, will be of very material importance in ascertaining how it was likely John the Baptist and our Lord's disciples, while acting under the Levitical dispensation, as they evidently did till the Saviour's resurrection, administered baptism. The passages in the New Testament, which more immediately direct us to this investigation, are the following:—

Mark vii. 4, 8. 'And when they come from the market, except they baptize, they eat not; and many other things there be which they have received to hold, as the baptizing of cups and pots, brazen vessels and tables.'

[1] Wall, vol. i. p. 34; Gale, p. 136; J. Stennett, p. 53.
[2] Lightfoot's Works, v. ii. p. 117, fol. [3] Gill's B. Div.
[4] P. 265. [5] Antiped. Exam., vol. ii. p. 231.

Heb. ix. 10. 'Which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers baptisms, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation.'

The former text refers to those purifications which were traditional, and common in the days of Christ. The latter, to such as were appointed by God himself. Both, however, may be fairly combined in this dissertation, as being both designated baptism. The question now is, how were these administered? The following remarks will answer this question, and indirectly establish our views respecting the scripture mode of this sacrament.

I. 'Jewish washings,' says Robinson, 'instituted, or not 'instituted, may be conveniently classed under four heads:

1. 'COMMON, for cleanliness, health, or pleasure, as the 'case of Pharoah's daughter (Ex. ii. 5), and Bathsheba '(2 SAM. ii. 2.)

II 'TRADITIONAL, as in MARK vii. 1-9.

III. 'RITUAL, as the consecration of the priests (Ex. xxix. '4); daily (Ex. xxx. 17); clothes stained with blood in 'offering sacrifices (LEV. vi. 27); utensils (v. 28); clean-'sing a leper (LEV. xiii. and xiv.); various uncleannesses '(LEV. xv. and xviii.)

IV. 'EXTRAORDINARY, as of Naaman (2 KINGS v. 10-'14); at the giving of the law (Ex. xix. 10); after a vic-'tory (NUMB. xxxi. 19-23); before entering the Jordan '(JOSH. iii. 5.)'[1]

As neither Mark nor Paul refer to the common washings mentioned in the first class, and as those of the second comprehend a part of the data on which we shall rest our evidence, those mentioned under the third and fourth divisions only demand consideration.

II. Let it then be clearly observed that the word to

[1] Hist. p. 31-35.

sprinkle is frequently used in the sacred writings and in reference to ritual worship, as synonymous with terms that unequivocally express an entire and universal purification; and the effects are equally significant and efficacious. It is employed by the inspired penmen for—

I. To CLEANSE.—'Then will I sprinkle clean water upon 'you and ye shall be clean—from all your filthiness and 'from all your idols will I cleanse you' (EZEK. xxxvi. 25.)

II. To PURGE.—'Purge me with hyssop [with which 'the blood, water, and oil, were sprinkled] and I shall be 'clean (PS. li. 7.) Moreover he sprinkled with blood both 'the tabernacle and the vessels of the ministry, and almost 'all things under the law are purged with blood' (HEB. ix. 21, 22).

III. To SANCTIFY.—'The blood of bulls, and of goats, and 'the ashes of an heifer, sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to 'the purifying of the flesh' (HEB. ix. 13).

IV. To WASH.—'Having our hearts sprinkled from an 'evil conscience and our bodies washed with pure water' (HEB. x. 22).

Consequently, when we read in the scriptures of persons being ceremonially cleansed, purged, sanctified, and washed, we are not certain that they were subject to any thing more than a sprinkling, unless the circumstances of the case render it apparent.

III. It is also plain beyond contradiction, that an application of the cleansing element to any one part of a person or thing, in the form of sprinkling, pouring, or otherwise, was always considered a valid and universal purification. Hence we read that a leper (LEV. xiv. 7), a person defiled by touching a dead body (NUMB. xix. 13, 20), the Jews as a nation (EZEK. xxxvi. 25), the Levites, or ser-

vants of the sanctuary (NUMB. viii. 7), a house (LEV. xiv. 51), the mercy seat (LEV. xvi. 14, 15), the tabernacle (HEB. ix. 21, 22), tents, vessels (NUMB. xix. 18), and the heart (HEB. x. 22), were universally cleansed, purged, sanctified, or washed, ceremonially, by a mere sprinkling—or by the application of the purifying element to a very small part of them. Kings, priests, and prophets, were wholly consecrated to their respective offices by pouring the holy oil on their heads, though it might have touched no other part of their person. An excellent commentator observes, that 'Aaron and his sons were the Lord's priests, though the 'blood of consecration was only put upon the tips of their 'ears, and on their thumbs and great toes (LEV. viii. 24). 'In the Lord's supper, eating a little bread and drinking a 'little wine, sufficeth to exhibit the thing signified—and we 'need not, nay, we should not, fill ourselves with either—'and yet it is called a supper.'[1] We read, that the congregation of the children of Israel was sanctified, as an assembly, or mass of individuals, by sprinkling blood on comparatively a few of them (Ex. xxiv. 7, 8; HEB. ix. 19.) This sentiment is illustrated and confirmed by one of our opponents. Speaking of dipping the pen in ink, he says, 'though the whole is not dipped all over, yet the part par-'ticularly referred to is, and the pen may be truly said to be 'dipped, according to that known rule:—What is true of 'any one part, may be said of the whole complexly, though 'not of every part of the whole separately.'[2] Hence the sprinkling or baptizing any part of the body, according to a rule well known among our brethren, is baptizing the whole of it—so that applying a few drops of blood on the unclean sanctifies them wholly.

[1] Matt. Henry on Bapt. p. 139, 140. [2] Gale, p. 114.

IV. It is also apparent that most of the rites which Paul designates baptisms were for the removal of local diseases and partial defilement. Consequently the purifications requisite were only local and partial. When our Lord commanded the young man born blind to go and wash in the pool of Siloam, the cleansing of his eyes was only intended (John ix. 7.) Naaman expected the prophet to put his hand over the affected place, and recover the leper (2 Kings v. 11.) This method is very apparent in Leviticus xv. which describes partial uncleannesses in the person and apparel, and prescribes bathing the body and washing the clothes in accordance with the nature and extent of the pollution. To imagine otherwise, would be to oppose the analogy of the Mosaic institutions, to run counter to the reason of things, and to make that necessary, which the scriptures have not. Indeed a plenary immersion must often have been impracticable in the wilderness, where pure water was so alarmingly scarce, as to be designated a land of drought and without water (Deut. viii. 15; Jer. ii. 6)—where the people murmured and rebelled for want of water (Ex. xvii. 3; Numb. xx. 2)—where the nobles themselves dug for water (Numb. xxi. 18)—and where, at the command of God, Moses smote the rock at Rephidim (Ex. xvii. 6), and at Kadesh (Numb. xx. 11), to procure supplies, to prevent them from perishing with thirst. That they in general obtained from the rocks, rains, wells, springs, or purchased with money (Numb. xx. 19; xxi. 22) sufficient for drink, for culinary purposes, and for such ablutions as we believe to have been instituted, is not to be doubted; but that they always had enough pure, fair, running water, uncontaminated by natural or moral defilement, for the daily immersion of at least two millions of people,

is what, without good authority, few will accredit:[1] and as such a total dipping was, in most cases, impracticable, so far all partial pollutions must have been needless. With equal propriety might Isaiah have commanded Hezekiah to plaister himself all over with lumps of figs for a boil on some particular part of the body (Is. xxviii. 21), as for the priests, without a divine injunction, which was not given, to have obliged every man, woman, and child, to wash themselves and their clothes entirely for a few pimples in the face, or a little filth on the hem of their garment.

V. It is also very remarkable that all the laws of Jewish purification were given to the Hebrews in a place where, as said above, there was comparatively no water, and when the performance of this rite, in the sense understood by our opponents, must have appeared impracticable to every person that heard them, and must have really been so for at least forty years:[2] and yet what Moses enjoined, in this respect, was never once objected to as impossible or even difficult, nor, that we learn, was it ever neglected through a scarcity of water, at any period, place, or under any circumstances. When the Legislator commanded them all to bathe, cleanse, wash, or sanctify themselves, they understood him to mean something that was then and there feasible; but the immersion of their whole body as often as the law rendered purification requisite, which Mr. Booth says was 'daily,'[3] and that for two millions of people, and during forty years in this desert—this waste, howling wilderness—was a thing impracticable. In fact, the local circumstances of the Hebrews at the time the laws of purification were given, are the best means we possess of under-

[1] See Harmer's Obs. ch. x. obs. 38; and Josephus Contra Apion, b. ii. s. 6.
[2] Calmet's Dict. Frag. No. 103, 116. [3] Booth, vol. i. p. 250.

standing the import of the terms employed—that is, in the sense those circumstances must have caused them to understand them. But to refer to the language itself:—The words employed by Moses by no means imply a total immersion. We read of *Bathing* the body ceremonially in the following texts: LEV. xv. 5, 8, 11, 13, 21, 22, 27; xvi. 26, 28; xvii. 15, 16; NUMB. xix. 7, 8, 19.—In all these passages the Hebrew word is RACHATZ, which means simply to wash.[1] It is translated in every place by LOUO in the Septuagint, and by LAVO in the Latin. We read of *Washing* the body for Levitical lustration in the ensuing texts: Ex. xxix. 4; xl. 12, 32; LEV. xiv. 8, 9; xv. 16; xvi. 14, 24; xvii. 16: xxii. 6.—In all these we have the same Hebrew original, with similar Greek and Latin translations. For washing the face, hands, feet, and clothes, the expressions are sometimes changed; but that is of no moment in the present enquiry. To contend that the divine Lawgiver commanded the people to plunge themselves or one another under water for legal impurities, is not only opposed to the circumstances of the case, but even to the plain letter of scripture.

VI. Let us now consider the several texts Mr. Robinson has referred to, as exhibiting the various kinds of ceremonial washings or ablutions among the Jews. These we shall cite at length for your fullest satisfaction :—

Exod. xix. 10. 'And the Lord said unto Moses, Go unto the people and sanctify them to-day and to-morrow, and let them wash their clothes.'

xxix. 4. 'And Aaron and his sons shalt thou bring unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, and shalt wash them with water.'

xxx. 18, 19. 'Thou shalt also make a laver of brass, and his foot also of brass, to wash withal; and thou shalt put it beween the

[1] See Taylor's Heb. Con. in Loc.

tabernacle of the congregation and the altar, and thou shalt put water therein; for Aaron and his sons shall wash their hands and their feet thereat.'

Lev. vi. 27, 28. 'And when there is sprinkled of the blood thereof upon any garment, thou shalt wash that whereon it was sprinkled in the holy place; and the earthen vessel wherein it is sodden shall be broken; and if it be sodden in a brazen pot, it shall be both scoured and rinsed in (or with) water.'

xiv. 7, 8. 'And he shall sprinkle upon him that is to be cleansed seven times, and shall pronounce him clean; and he that is to be cleansed shall wash his clothes and shave off his hair, and wash himself in (or with) water, that he may be clean.'

xv. 5. 'And whosoever toucheth his bed, shall wash his clothes, and bathe himself in (or with) water, and be unclean until the even.' (See v. 6, 7, &c.)

Numb. xix. 19. 'And the clean person shall sprinkle upon the unclean on the third day and on the seventh day; and on the seventh day, he [that purified the unclean, v. 22] shall purify himself in (or with) water, and shall be clean at even.'

Josh. iii. 5. 'And Joshua said unto the people sanctify yourselves; for to-morrow the Lord will do wonders among you.'

Numb. xxxi. 19-23. 'Whosoever hath killed any person, and whosoever hath touched any slain, purify both yourselves and your captives; and all your raiment, and all that is made of skins, and all work of goat's-hair, and all things made of wood; every thing that may abide the fire, ye shall make it go through the fire, and it shall be clean; nevertheless it shall be purified with the water of separation; and all that abideth not the fire, ye shall make go through the water; and ye shall wash your clothes on the seventh day, and ye shall be clean.'

The passage, in 2 KINGS v. 10-14, has been cited and considered already. We have now quoted all that is material to our present investigation.

VII. From these citations it is plain that the personal ablutions, which Paul designates baptisms, may be divided into two heads—what people did to themselves and what others did to them—or, in other words, what was self-operated and what was ministerial.

1. What people did to themselves was to wash their clothes and bathe themselves in or with water. Whether this bathing and washing consisted in a total or partial wetting, you will judge from the preceding evidence. That they were only partial is plain; and this would answer every end of the Legislator, and best accord with the circumstances of the Hebrews. As stated before, these ceremonial purgations must have been very frequent, both in the wilderness and in the Holy Land, among such a vast congregation of people as the Israelites. In the desert, water was a very precious article, as we gather from the frequent murmurings of the people for want of it. And in Judea, the scarcity must often have been excessive, as will be more fully established hereafter. (See 1 KINGS, xvii. and xviii. Is. xliii. 20; JER. xiv. 1-6). The repeated and almost daily saturation of the garments would soon have rendered them ragged and colourless. But to pass over the apparel and to come to the people, who, we will suppose for a moment, contrary to fact, did absolutely *dip themselves* over head and ears in water every time they became polluted, according to the laws of Moses—but this bears no analogy or affinity to the baptisms of our opponents—which consist in the 'action performed by one man upon another.'[1] Let us hear their explicit statements on this point: 'Except 'in the single circumstance of dipping, none of these washings bear the least resemblance to Christian baptism; and 'this circumstance is a mere accident, and may as well be 'taken from Pagan rituals as from the ceremonies of the 'Jews; that is to say, it is so vague and far-fetched, that 'it deserves, in this point of view, no consideration at all.'[2] 'A fact it is, beyond all contradiction, that this same prose-

[1] Maclean, v. iii. p. 188. [2] Rob. Hist. p. 35.

'lyte washing, which men have thought fit to call baptism, 'is no baptism at all. It was a person's washing himself, and 'not the dipping of one person by another. It would ap- 'pear that a proselyte *washed himself;* but this is *not bap- 'tism.*[1] A law for one man to dip himself is not an au- 'thority for another man to dip him.'[2] From this state- ment it is plain, that if a man dip himself under water a thousand times, he is not thereby baptized; for this simple reason, that baptism necessarily consists in the 'action per- 'formed by one man upon another.' Nor is Mr. Robinson singular in his judgment in this case; for self-immersion is not only never now practised by our opponents, but is universally exploded as improper and invalid. This rite is administered only by a person who has been previously baptized, and who is recognized as a Christian officer in the church. We must, therefore, look to the transitive act exhibited in the above quotations, to discover what Paul meant by baptism in his Epistle to the Hebrews.

II. What people did to each other. The apostle positively calls these purifications 'baptisms,' which God imposed on the Jews until the time of reformation. In this designation our opponents accord. We also know that these washings or ablutions were of two kinds—a person bathing himself in or with water—and another applying water to him, by pouring or sprinkling. Now, as you have heard, our op- ponents unequivocally assure us that the first is not bap- tism—consequently the second alone is baptism. The priests, or the people who were clean, sprinkled upon others oil, blood, or water, either pure or impregnated with the ashes of the red heifer: therefore sprinkling, pouring, or applying one or all of these elements, is what Paul means

[1] Rob. p. 36. [2] P. 39.

by the term baptism; and as our brethren have thus excluded washing and bathing one's self, as a part of baptism, we are driven to conclude with Mr. Maclean[1] and Dr. Gill,[2] that the diversity consists in the various elements employed and the different effects produced. An eminent Baptist writer justly observes, 'that sprinkling upon the 'people either by blood (as Ex. xxiv. 8; xxix. 21; Lev. 'xiv. 7, &c.), or by water mixed with the ashes of a red 'heifer (Numb. xix; Heb. xi. 13, &c.), because it was a 'type of cleansing by Christ for sin, is metaphorically put 'for it, (Is. lii. 15; Heb. x. 22; xii. 24; 1 Pet. i. 2.)'[3] When, therefore, Dr. Jenkins says, 'the divers washings 'in the Jewish service did imply washing *in* water; and 'as their being *wholly unclean* supposed the need of a total 'washing, so it is reasonable to think the ablution was a 'total immersion; for that the sprinkling was no part of the 'baptism, you may read Numb. xix. 21: the water of se-'paration did not cleanse:'[4]—it must be manifest to every attentive hearer, that the good Doctor had but very superficially examined this subject; and, through want of more light on the point, was misleading his readers. In fact, he contradicts the plain and unequivocal sense of scripture.[5]

VIII. The isolated text (Ex. xxix. 4), which speaks of Moses washing Aaron and his sons at the door of the tabernacle, in no degree militates against our doctrine, but rather confirms it. That Moses performed an act upon Aaron and his sons which, in ceremonial technicalities, is called washing, is evident. The question however is, what that act was? No sea of brass was then erected for the service of the sanctuary, nor do we read of any other vessel

[1] Vol. iii. p. 190. [2] P. 225. [3] Keach's Met. p. 183.
[4] Defence, p. 113. [5] *Supra*, p. 246.

sufficiently large for totally submersing the High Priest and his grown-up sons; neither is it likely that those, whose sacred persons were never in the least to be indelicately exposed in the service of the altar but at the peril of their lives (ch. xxviii. 42, 43), should be stripped naked, dipped, lathered, and washed by Moses in the sight of all the congregation, summoned expressly to witness the ceremony, (Lev. viii. 4-6.) There is no question but the priests and Levites were washed by Moses in the same manner. How he acted with regard to the latter we learn from the following text:—'Take the Levites from among the children of 'Israel and cleanse them, sprinkling water of purifying 'upon them; and let them shave all their flesh, and let 'them wash their clothes, and make themselves clean,' (Numb. viii. 6, 7.) Here all that Moses did was sprinkling them with water; and as the above passage is admitted by our opponents to be the only one in the Old Testament representing one person actually and literally washing another, for ceremonial purposes;[1] as we read of no instance where one person dipped another;[2] and as what is denominated washing, sanctifying, purging, and cleansing one another, was in every other case performed by sprinkling, pouring, or otherwise applying the element to the object; we submit that it was done by Moses in the same way. (See Ezek. xxxvi. 25.) We conclude, therefore, that the baptisms mentioned by the apostle are 'called 'divers, because they were performed on different occasions 'and for various kinds of uncleanness;'[3] and consisted in sprinkling, pouring, or otherwise applying to the people, blood, oil, or water, either pure or impregnated with ashes; and that the other rite common among the Jews, consist-

[1] Rob. p. 35. [2] Ib. p. 29. [3] Maclean, v. iii. p. 190.

ing in bathing or washing themselves in or with water, was not baptism at all.

IX. Remark further, that as baptism under the gospel is analogous to anointing or consecrating under the law, as will be shown hereafter; so, of course, anointing under the law is figurative of baptism under the gospel; and is, doubtless, included by the apostle in the expression, 'divers baptisms.' We find that priests (Ex. xxviii. 41), kings (1 Kings i. 34), and prophets (Is. lxi. 1), were thus baptized or consecrated to their respective offices; so were things, as the altar (Ex. xxix. 36), the tabernacle and the ark (Ex. xxx. 26), the laver and his foot (Ex. xl. 11): Jacob also anointed the pillar he set up (Gen. xxviii. 18); the Jewish nation, as a kingdom of priests and a holy people, were consecrated to God, (Exod. xix. 6.) The language put into their mouths, and to be sung by each in the solemn assembly on the sabbath, was, 'I shall 'be anointed with fresh oil' (Ps. xcii. 10); and God, referring to his gracious interference on behalf of his people, said, 'Touch not mine anointed, and do my prophets no 'harm,' (Ps. cv. 15.) This anointing was typical of the influence of the Spirit.[1] Now, we find similar phraseology under the gospel dispensation: —'He which esta-'blisheth us with you in Christ, and hath anointed us, is 'God; who hath also sealed us, and given us the earnest 'of his Spirit in our hearts,' (2 Cor. i. 21, 22.) 'We have 'an unction [or anointing] from the Holy One; but the 'anointing which we have received of him abideth in you '—the same anointing teacheth you all things,' (1 John ii. 20, 27.) From this we gather, that anointing with oil under the law, and with the Holy Spirit under the

[1] See Dr. J. Owen's Works, v. ii. p. 163; v. iii. p. 404.

gospel, are of a like import, as type and antetype; and as the baptisms of water and of the Spirit are one in design, as a figure and the reality, we may fairly conclude, without strong reasons to the contrary, that pouring water is truly scriptural baptism. This element, being cheaper than costly oil, was substituted for it; and sprinkling, being a more expeditious mode than pouring, was often adopted instead of it—though the intentions were the same.

X. Dr. Gale says, 'the vast brazen sea which Solomon 'caused to be made, held near a thousand barrels of water: 'the bulk of it argues that the priests were to go into it.'[1] This inference, however, is gratuitous. Cisterns, tanks, and reservoirs of water, are often made for purposes widely different from that of going into them. This sea was, at least, nine feet deep, and 'stood raised upon the figures 'of twelve oxen in brass, so high that either that they must 'have had stairs to it, or cocks at the bottom to draw off the 'water from it.'[2] Now, if the priestly purifications required pure or fair water, as our opponents admit, and if the blood and filth, contracted by the officers in slaying the sacrifices, would have polluted the water—a case that no person of judgment would ever dispute—the consequence of dipping themselves into this vessel (and which, after all, was no baptism) would have been, that every time a priest bathed himself, all the foul water, to the amount of a thousand barrels, must have been drained off, and the poor Gibeonites and Nethinims, with leathern bottles, must have filled it afresh from some neighbouring spring before another priest could have washed himself therein; and as these personal lustrations must have been performed by one

[1] P. 128. See Gill, p. 455; and Anderson, p. 20.
[2] Matt. Henry on 1 Kings vii. 23.

or other several times a day, the drawers of water must have had no sinecure office. Then there would have been the difficulty of getting in and out of this elevated vessel. That the priests and Levites would not have done this naked, will be evident to all; and that they would hardly have climbed up, and popped themselves under water in their clothes, and then have climbed out, and have gone to work again, dripping with water, is equally apparent. But the brazen sea was to be used in the same way and for the same purpose as the laver of the tabernacle. What mode was adopted with it, we read in the plainest terms: —'And he set the laver between the tent of the congre-'gation and the altar, and put water there to wash withal. 'And Moses and Aaron and his sons washed their *hands* 'and their *feet* thereat. When they went into the tent of 'the congregation, and when they came near unto the altar, 'they washed as the Lord commanded Moses,' (Exod. xl. 30-33.) This view of the case is confirmed by Josephus: —'Now he appointed the sea to be for washing the hands 'and the feet of the priests, when they entered into the 'temple, and were to ascend the altar.'[1] — So much for dipping into the brazen sea!

XI. As a further confirmation of our assumption, let it be remarked, that the order of the priesthood, the species of the sacrifices, and the mode of purification prevalent among the *Greeks*, as described by Archbishop Potter,[2] were evidently of Hebrew original. No person can peruse the chapter referred to, without perceiving the analogy, and concluding that this was the fact. Now, purifications among the Greeks, as among the Jews, were of two kinds: —what the people did to themselves, and what was done

[1] Ant. b. 8, c. 3, s. 6. [2] Antiq. of Greece, v. ii. b. 3, c. 4, p. 247-265.

to them by the priests. As to the former, they washed their clothes and the whole body. When this could not be conveniently performed, they washed their hands and feet as a substitute. This self-ablution, however, on the evidence of our opponents, was not baptism, but only a preparation for it. As to the latter, we learn that the priest purified the people by sprinkling them. Pure or salt water only was to be used. This was kept in a small vessel, called the *perironterion*, at the entrance of the temples. A triple aspersion was administered. This was done with a torch, or branch of laurel or olive. The design was to free from guilt and cleanse from pollution. This was really their baptism, and accords with the practice of John the Baptist, a Jewish priest, and with that of the apostles of our Lord, as we have proved before. This is confirmed by Justin Martyr, an eminent Christian writer, born about sixty years after the death of Christ. His words, though quoted before, we shall recite in this place. He says, 'sprinkling with holy 'water was invented by demons, in imitation of the true 'baptism signified by the prophets, that their votaries might 'have their pretended purifications by water.' From this passage it appears, that the lustrations of the heathen were borrowed from the purifications of the Jews—both are designated baptism, and both were administered by sprinkling. How the Greeks baptized, you have just heard. Virgil, who died about ten years before the birth of Christ, tells us, in the plainest terms, how it was performed by the Romans :—

'A verdant branch of olives in his hands,
'He moved around and purified the bands;
'Slow as he passed, the lustral waters shed,
'Then closed the rites, and thrice invoked the dead.' [1]

[1] Pitt's Virgil, Æn. VI. v. 229. See Juvenal's Sat. II. v. 157.

We can hardly read this passage without calling to mind the following text :—'And a clean person shall take hyssop, 'and dip it in the water, and sprinkle it upon the tent and 'upon all the vessels, and upon the persons that were there, 'and upon him that touched a bone, or one slain, or one 'dead, or a grave' (Numb. xix. 18.) The analogy here is complete. From what Mr. Robinson has written on pagan lustration,[1] it is not deducible that any other mode than sprinkling was ever adopted by any nations, the most ancient or remote. This accounts for the silence of the enemies of the gospel, respecting the mode of Christian baptism, as administered by the apostles, by sprinkling—whereas, had they gone about the different countries of the world dipping their converts under water, a practice so novel would surely have called forth observations and opposition—as was the case in almost every thing in Christianity that differed from the modes of gentile worship—and particularly so, if the manner of performing it had been equally difficult, indelicate, and dangerous, as is modern immersion, in many well authenticated instances.

XII. The only passage referred to by Mr. Robinson, which has the least appearance of opposing our scheme, is Numb. xxxi. 23, where it is said that the spoils of war which could not stand the fire, were to 'go through the water.' This text, however, refers to an extraordinary purification, and therefore is no regularly applicable rule for purifications generally. It involves the sanctification of things as well as of men, and consequently does not peculiarly effect personal ablutions. Still, however, we do not imagine the phrase to make for immersion. It should be noticed that the water to be used was that of separation,[2] which was

[1] P. 418-422. [2] Ib. p. 35.

made by putting the ashes of a red heifer into a vessel and pouring running water upon them (Numb. xix. 9, 17.) The size of the vessel is not specified, but from its general use was probably not very large, being carried about in the wilderness. It is evident that this water of separation was always sprinkled upon the persons and things to be consecrated.[1] Thus the Levites were purified (c. viii. 7), and so were those who had touched one slain with the sword in the open fields, or a dead body, or a bone of a man, or a grave, with his tent and vessels (c. xix. 13-21; xxxi. 19.) This last case is a key to the one under consideration, as the circumstances are similar. The water of separation was to purify twelve thousand Israelites who had fought, and thirty-two thousand captives taken in the engagement and after, (c. xxxi. 12, 19, 32); as, also, all the inanimate spoils of war — gold, silver, brass, iron, tin, lead, and all hings made of skins, goat's hair, and wood; utensils, instruments, garments, tents, chariots, and waggons; with jewels of gold, chains, bracelets, rings, ear-rings, and tablets, (v. 50.) That these spoils must have been immense we may gather from the fact that the Hebrews took from the Midianites 675,000 sheep, 72,000 beeves, and 61,000 asses. And the present made to the treasury of the Lord was valued at 16,750 shekels. We, then, enquire whether it was possible that all these immense, and many of them cumbrous spoils of war, were absolutely plunged into the vessel which contained the water of separation; or, literally, were made to go through the water? Impossible! Indeed we cannot suppose that by going through the fire it was intended casting the metals into the flames, especially the tin and lead, as the preservation and not the destruction of the

[1] Josephus, Ant. b. 4, c. 4, s. 6.

articles was the object of the operation. They were to be purified by fire in some way or other, but how is not certain. It is, moreover, plain that the expression, 'purified 'with the water of separation,' and 'going through the 'water,' mean one and the same process, which was unquestionably sprinkling. The sense of the text is, that the articles which would stand the fire, were to be first purified by fire, and secondly with the water of separation; and those which would not, were to undergo the purification of water only.

XIII. The Jewish baptisms in the days of our Lord require a brief consideration. The following texts comprehend their practice. 'For the Pharisees and all the Jews, 'except they wash their hands oft eat not, holding the tra- 'dition of the elders, and when they come from the market 'except they baptize they eat not, (MARK vii. 3, 4.) And 'when the Pharisee saw it, he marvelled that he had not 'first baptized before dinner, (LUKE xi. 38.) Why do thy 'disciples transgress the tradition of the elders? for they 'wash not their hands, when they eat bread,' (MATT. xv. 2.) Here the word baptize is twice used for the purification of the Pharisees and all the Jews, whenever they came from the market, and before they ate bread. Our opponents say that 'the baptism mentioned MARK vii. 4; LUKE xi. 38, 'does not signify the washing of the hands, but the bathing 'or immersion of the whole body.'[1] So then, all the ladies and gentlemen, their servants and children, who were Jews, and especially if belonging to the sect of the Pharisees, actually plunged themselves over head and ears in water every time they came from the market, though it occurred half a dozen times a day, and always before they sat down

[1] Maclean, vol. iii. p. 190.

to dinner or took a luncheon between meals! But the fact is, that their baptizing themselves consisted in nothing more than washing their hands, as the above collation of passages most clearly demonstrates. Nor is there any impropriety in the phraseology; for, as Dr. Gale assures us, that 'what is 'true of any one part, may be said of the whole complexly.'[1] Consequently, baptizing their hands, is baptizing themselves. But then, perhaps, our brethren will reply, they dipped their hands to wash them—since Dr. Gill says, 'there is no proper washing but by dipping.'[2]—In answer we say, certainly not. This was a ceremonial cleansing, and not a removal of natural defilement. Hence we read that Elisha 'poured water on the hands of Elijah,' (2 Kings iii. 11.) Homer, who flourished about fifty years after Elijah, refers to a similar practice amongst the Greeks:—

'Then came a nymph,
'With golden ewer charged and silver bowl,
'Who *poured pure water on my hands*, and placed
'The shining stand before me.'[3]

If this ancient custom were altered in the days of Christ, our opponents will prove it. The practice is still common in the east. Sir J. Ker Porter was at an entertainment given by the prime minister of Persia. 'A silver plated jug,' he says, 'with a long spout, accompanied by a bason of the 'same metal, was carried round to every guest, by an at-'tendant, who *poured water* from the jug *on our right hands*, 'which we held in succession over the bason.'[4] It is even continued among the Jews to the present time as a religious ceremony; for, in their synagogue worship, those Levites who are descendants from the singers in the temple, are

[1] P. 114. [2] P. 303. [3] Odyssey X. 367-370.
[4] Trav. in Georgia, v. i. p. 238, 239. See also Wall, v. iii. p. 96.

called next to the descendants of the priests, to read or hear the law, and to pour *water over the hands* of the Cohenim, or priests, before they go to the benediction.[1] Even Dr. Campbell, cited with so much triumph by our opponents in this controversy, explains 'washing the hands oft, by '*pouring water upon them*'[2]—a method probably suggested at first by the scarcity of pure water in arid climates. Hence Abraham ordered a *little* water to wash the feet of his heavenly visitants (GEN. xviii. 4); and which water was probably poured *(epi tois podas)* upon the feet, (LUKE vii. 44.) In this way Christ must have washed his disciples' feet, while they probably reclined on their couches after supper.[3] For it is not likely that twelve persons who wore sandals should dip their feet successively in the same bason of water, and that Peter, who appears to have been the last, should have desired that his hands and his head might be washed in this polluted element. Here, then, we have baptizing a person by washing his hands, and this performed by pouring water upon them. And if pouring water on the hands be a valid and entire baptism of the person, surely pouring it on the head cannot be deemed partial or defective.

XIV. The baptismal purifications of the Jews in the days of Christ, may be further elucidated by the following passage: 'And there were set there six water-pots of stone, 'after the manner of the purifying of the Jews, containing 'two or three firkins a piece,' (JOHN ii. 6.) According to Dr. Jennings, these vessels held 'about twenty gallons each.'[4] That the guests at the marriage in Cana, could not immerse themselves entirely in these stone water-pots is unquestionable. It is also evident, that immediately previous to

[1] Adams's Rel. W. Displ. v. ii. p. 309. [2] In Loc.
[3] Calmet's Dict. Frag. No. 104. [4] Jewish Antiq. p. 426,

the miracle of our Lord, they contained very little or no water, as he ordered the waiters to fill them. Now, had they been used that evening as bathing-tubs, the Saviour would not have shocked the company, by ordering the servants to draw wine out of them for their potations. If they were employed for holding what the Catholics call holy-water, largely provided against the wedding, and which was poured, as in the cases above mentioned, or sprinkled on the visitors—all appears delicate, and in harmony with the customs of the people and the times. This mode of purification, also, was after the manner of the Jews—such water-pots being general, at least in respectable houses, and this mode of purifying out of them common. Mr. Maclean says, 'though the Jews were blamed 'for their superstition in holding things unclean that were 'not so, yet they are not accused of using any other me-'thod of cleansing than the law prescribed.'[1] When our opponents talk of every family having baths for ceremonial baptisms,[2] they appear to forget that the inspired writer has said they were stone vessels of comparatively small dimensions, placed in the room where the people usually sat, and which precluded the possibly of immersing themselves or one another into them. Here, then, is purification or baptism again by pouring or sprinkling, or by applying the element to the object.

XV. Though the baptizing of cups and pots, brazen vessels, and couches (Mark vii. 1-9), has been slightly noticed before, it may not be improper here to revert for a moment to this subject. You will then carefully bear in mind that the ceremony in question was not performed in compliance with the dictates of decency, as such articles

[1] Vol. iii. p. 190. [2] Gill, v. ii. p. 215, 460.

had been cleansed from ordinary pollution long before the baptisms referred to above were introduced. What the evangelist means, was a ceremonial purification superadded to common washings and entirely independent of them. It is called the tradition of men and the tradition of the elders, and was, of course, irrespective of ordinary washing of domestic furniture.[1] This is still more apparent from the fact, as one of our opponents justly observes, that 'whatever these 'washings or baptisms were, they were traditional and cen-'sured by Christ.'[2] But as the Son of God would never have censured the Jews for mere cleanliness, we must again conclude, that the same species of baptism was applied to their utensils as was common among themselves. The mode of purification was not censured, but the frequency and objects of the administration. How articles were ceremonially consecrated or cleansed, we have seen before, and shall here recite the text:—'And a clean person shall take 'hyssop, and dip it in the water, and sprinkle it upon the 'tent, and upon all the *vessels*, and upon the persons that 'were there, and upon him that touched a bone, or one 'slain, or one dead, or a grave,' (NUMB. xix. 18.) Notwithstanding all our opponents have cited from the later Rabbis, we cannot conceive how beds or couches were lustrated otherwise. At any rate, there is not the least intimation of their being immersed for ceremonial purification in the days of our incarnate Lord or under the Mosaic dispensation.

XVI. Josephus, speaking of the Essens, one of the three sects of the Jews existing in his day, says, 'After 'morning prayer, every one of them are sent away by their 'curators to exercise some of those arts wherein they are

[1] Dr. Campbell in Loc. [2] Rob. p. 32.

'skilled, in which they labour with great diligence till the 'fifth hour: after which they assemble themselves together 'again in one place; and when they have clothed them-'selves in white veils [or garments], they then bathe their 'bodies in cold water; and after this purification is over, 'they every one meet together in an apartment of their 'own—after a pure manner, into the dining room.'[1] Now a superficial observer, reading this passage, would immediately conclude, as some of our opponents appear to have done,[2] that these all plunged themselves or one another under water every day. But that this was not the case is apparent from the following circumstances:—The language as understood by a Jew, as employed in the Pentateuch, and as adapted to Judea, does not necessarily convey the necessity of a total immersion. To wash themselves *(apolountai)* with water, being all that is expressed or intended. It is said, in a subsequent section, that after having been on trial a year, the candidate for communion approaches nearer this way of living, and is made partaker of the water of purification[3]—language which does not exactly comport with the idea of dipping into it. This lustration was peculiar to the fully initiated candidates for Essenism, and was not therefore common to all the Jews, as were the baptisms mentioned at the head of this section. It also took place after they had put on their white veils or garments, and in this same dress they all immediately dined together,[4] which would hardly be done had they dipped one another. The purification was to be repeated by a senior every time he happened to touch a junior, and on other nameless occasions[5]—so that these people, espe-

[1] Hist. Wars, b. 2, c. 8. s. 5. [2] Booth, v. i. p. 250.
[3] Sec. 7. [4] Sec. 9. [5] Sec. 10.

cially the old men, must have been immersed, at least, three times a day; and, when they were ill, perhaps half a dozen—and all this in the land of Judea, while engaged in their husbandry or handicraft employments! How much more consistent with every idea we can form of the Jews, their character, customs, and country, is it to suppose they were affused or sprinkled with pure water; which probably was kept in suitable places—call them fonts, if you please—for such a purpose. If they had even gone into baths for cleansing, it does not prove that they dipped themselves or each other under water. The greater purifications of the Mahometans, which are supposed to have been borrowed from the bathings of the later Jews,[1] consist in simply going into a bath, ancle or knee deep, and applying the water to their persons in the ordinary manner. They never dip themselves or each other under water for any ceremonial lustration.

XVII. To these expositions an objection has been raised by our brethren; who say it was not at all probable that Christ should sanctify to an evangelical purpose any of those rites and customs which were of Jewish origin, and particularly such as were not of divine appointment.[2] In reply, we observe that John the Baptist, our blessed Redeemer and his disciples, in many cases, did act in conformity to the rites and customs of the Hebrew economy, which was in full force till the glorious morning of the Saviour's resurrection. Nor have our brethren adduced a single valid argument for making the ancient mode of baptizing an exception to their general rule. Our Lord not only complied with the prescribed rites of Moses and other ceremonies of heavenly origin; but he also adopted and

[1] Rob. Hist. p. 56. [2] J. Stennett, p. 62; Ryland, p. 4.

spiritualized modes and customs of which no such institution can be adduced. He engaged in the peculiar formularies of synagogue worship, the establishment of which, for aught we learn, was wholly of men,[1] (Luke iv. 16-30.) He observed the feast of dedication, appointed by the sole authority of Judas Maccabeus,[2] (1 Macc. iv. 52-55; John x. 22.) He consecrated the ancient custom of washing each other's feet to an expressive token of Christian charity and humility, (Gen. xviii. 4; 2 Sam. xxv. 41; John xiii. 5-16; 1 Tim. v. 10.) He set apart a portion of the paschal feast, to be eaten as a standing memorial of his death[3] (Mark xiv. 22-25); and, in imitation of John, a Jewish priest, and the Rabbis, he gave his disciples a form of prayer, composed, according to Wetstein, Whitby, *Gill*, and others, out of the synagogue service used at that period.[4] He also selected twelve disciples in respect of the twelve tribes of Israel, and seventy others, as according with the seventy elders and members of the Sanhedrim, to be his followers and assistants in the work of the ministry, (Luke ix. 1; x. 1.) It is also evident that the terms and phraseology, prevalent in the Levitical economy, are retained in the New Testament—hence we read of sacrifices, oblations, ablutions, aspersions, perfumes, synagogue (Jas. ii. 2, Gr.), passover, temple, circumcision, altar, sabbath, unleavened bread, and the like, in an evangelical sense. 'It is well known,' says Dr. Campbell, 'that the 'names, teacher, elder, overseer, attendant or minister, and 'even angel or messenger of the congregation, were, in re-'lation to the ministry of the Jewish synagogue, in current

[1] Prideaux's Con. v. ii. p. 499-523.

[2] Ib. v. iii. p. 265; Josephus, Ant. b. 12, c. 8, s. 7.

[3] See Ainsworth on Ex. xii. 8; Dodd. Expos. sect. 148, note *e*.

[4] Mendham on the Lord's Prayer, p. 17.

'use;'[1] and Dr. Pye Smith observes, 'that Jesus Christ 'himself drew much of the language and manner of his 'discourses from the current phrases and formularies of the 'synagogue.'[2] And though the Saviour condemned certain traditional observances as superstitious and making void the law of God (MATT. xv. 3-8), it cannot be too much to say, with the facts before us, that he sanctified the priestly method of purification or consecration common among his ancient people, whether divinely appointed or not, to be the standing method of Christian baptism. Nor let any one suppose, that this species of arguing opens a door for any denomination to introduce the priestly orders, the state religion, or the pompous ceremonies of the Jewish hierarchy into the present dispensation. To adopt from the preceding economy what it appears our Lord and his disciples selected and sanctified to a gospel purpose, is all we contend for or can admit into our churches. This is not only a safe, but also a fair way of reasoning on the subject.

XVIII. From this rather elaborate investigation, the following deductions appear to be natural and legitimate.

I. That purification and baptism under the law as well as under the gospel, were one and the same thing in design, and their modes of performance alike. The first is plainly asserted by the apostle, as you have seen before, and is also admitted by our opponents, who call baptism 'a minister's 'washing a person, and God's washing away his sins by the 'blood of Christ;'[3] and say, that 'it leads to the nature of 'sanctification, and offers an emblem of it;'[4] and that it is 'a washing all over, and abundant purification.'[5]

II. That the ministerial baptisms or purifications among

[1] Lect. on Eccl. Hist. Lect. X. [2] Messiah, v. i. p. 602.
[3] D'Anvers, p. 16, 18. [4] Burt, p. 24, 26. [5] Ryland, p. 27, 34.

the Jews, did not consist in people's bathing themselves, but in what one person did to another; and this was always and only an affusion or sprinkling with blood, oil, or water—and that there is no instance where one person is said to have immersed another under water for consecration or purification—therefore sprinkling is truly baptizing.

III. That among the Jews, to baptize another person, was to pour or sprinkle the element on him—neither more nor less. This mode of lustration was borrowed and practised among the Greeks and Romans, and the Heathens generally. The remark of Justin, cited above, is corroborated by Tertullian, who says, 'Here we see the aim of the 'devil, to ape [or imitate] the things of God; since he also 'sets up a baptism for his disciples.'[1] Consequently, their procedure in this matter illustrates the method of the Israelites, and affords a clue to unravel the operations of John the Baptist and the disciples of our Lord.

IV. That the harbinger of Christ and his own disciples would naturally consecrate their followers by pouring or sprinkling—since they could have been acquainted with no other practice—since their mode was evidently no novelty—and since we have no account of any new practice being enjoined.

SECTION FOURTH.

SEVERAL INSTANCES OF SCRIPTURE BAPTISM.

The circumstances to be examined unquestionably prove that the apostolic mode of baptism was not by dipping, immersing, or otherwise applying the person to the water.

[1] Wall's Hist. v. I. p. 10. See Gale's Court of the Gentiles, *passim*.

From what has been advanced you are doubtless convinced that the terms employed to express this rite by no means prove, that any person was ever put under water in the administration of this ordinance by John the Baptist or the disciples of our Lord. You have, also, seen that the expressions used to designate this ceremony, are as much in accordance with pouring and sprinkling as with dipping and immersing. That Jewish baptisms, which were of constant occurrence before and during the days of Christ's personal ministry, were performed by pouring or sprinkling. We shall now adduce further circumstantial evidence to establish our position. This may be easily deduced from the administration of this rite in the primitive church, and even from those cases which apparently most favour the scheme of our opponents. We purpose, first, to offer a few preliminary considerations, and then to investigate those narratives of baptism, in which the circumstances afford us any intimations respecting the definitive action at issue between us and our esteemed brethren.

I. It may be observed, as a general remark, that in all the baptisms of the New Testament no delays were ever necessary or ever made. Whenever persons were brought over from a profession of Judaism or Gentilism to the adoption of Christianity, they were baptized immediately. We read of no postponements on account of numbers, sex, size, delicacy, health, dresses, want of water, or any thing of the kind. Wherever the apostles preached with success, then and there they baptized their converts—whether the season were hot or cold, wet or dry, day or night; whether the people were old or young, male or female, in sickness or in health. To the mode they adopted there arose no obstacles from time, place, audience, or circumstances.

Hence Mr. Robinson justly remarks, 'there was no inter-'mediate state of scholarship; baptism was administered 'immediately on conviction of the truth of the report.'[1] Thus when many of the Samaritans of Sychar believed on our Lord (JOHN iv. 39, 41), and were baptized immediately on accrediting the truth of the report, pure water, though fetched from Jacob's well, which was distant and deep, was procured—but, whether for immersion, we leave you to judge. So when the three thousand were converted, under Peter's sermon, every requisite was then and there ready for an apostolic baptism, though water was exceedingly precious in the city of Jerusalem. Nor do we read of any changing of apparel, or laying aside of garments, as Christ did when about to wash only the feet of his disciples (JOHN xiii. 4), nor of clothes made on purpose, with weights at the bottom to make them sink, nor of cloaks to throw over the shoulders of the baptized to hide their appearance on coming up out of the water—nor of wax or oil-skin drawers, or leathern boots above the middle, for the minister. The people were baptized and went immediately to their friends or engaged in their ordinary occupations. But this is not the case with those whose method is immersion—nor, in fact, is it possible. Dresses must be manufactured expressly for the occasion—delicacy and sickness must be consulted—water of a certain depth and in a proper situation must be procured—apparel must be shifted—many preparations must be made—all of which consume considerable time and occasion delays unknown to the apostles. Does not this indicate a great difference between scripture baptism and modern dipping? And would not the New Testament narratives of baptism appear natural

[1] Hist. p. 234.

and easy on the principle that pouring or sprinkling was the original mode.

II. In the baptisms administered by John to the multitudes that followed him, and of the three thousand baptized on the day of Pentecost, we perceive insuperable obstacles to the system of dipping. Most, if not all, of these people were from home when baptized, many of them, indeed, at a very considerable distance, (Acts ii. 5-11.) When they went to hear these celebrated preachers, most of them, no doubt, prompted by curiosity, they could have had no intention of being baptized, as they had none of being induced to solicit it. And, surely, in the case of John the Baptist, they could not have anticipated being put under water, since it is universally agreed that such a thing had never been done before. Their conviction of the truth of the report and baptism were, as far as practicable, effected at the same time. In fact, most of those pricked to the heart, under the criminatory sermon of Peter, were among the most ungodly of their kind, and were mere visitors in the city. Antecedent preparation for baptism with them was entirely out of the question. Neither do we read of their having second suits of attire with them—nor of their borrowing change of raiment from their neighbours, who, being themselves mostly unconvinced, were not likely to lend them three thousand suits, to be saturated in the water, or to be worn away by persons of whom they knew nothing personally, and whom they despised on account of their credulity. To dipping here, the obstructions are immense. But, on the supposition that affusion or aspersion was the mode, every difficulty is immediately removed.

III. As our opponents assume, that the people baptized by John and our Saviour's disciples, had change of raiment

with them, we will, merely for the sake of argument for the moment, admit the assumption. But what must have been the consequence of using it in out-of-door dippings, and particularly in the wilderness, or on the banks of the Jordan? Why, they must have taken off every article of dress they had on, first before they went into the water, and again after they came out—and so must have been naked twice before the multitude. To have removed part of their apparel, if their inner garments remained on, would have answered no end proposed in changing at all. This, you will observe, must have been the case with all the blushing damsels and portly matrons who came to John's baptism: and then, as they would not be very likely to bundle up their clothes, wet and streaming with water, we must next suppose that they, one and all, spread them on the ground or bushes to dry, and remained to watch them till the rays of the sun had absorbed the saturation. All this must have been the case with those who were baptized out of doors, especially in the desert by John the Baptist, and such as subsequently retired to rivers to receive this sacrament. The erection of a parcel of tents for shifting their clothes, is a mere fancy of our opponents, adduced to remove, if possible, an insuperable difficulty that stares every child in the face, and which our brethren can find recorded in the New Testament no more than the baptism of infants. We conclude, therefore, that John baptized out of doors—at least, by pouring or sprinkling—for this removes all difficulties.

IV. Should our friends, to remove the foregoing perplexities, argue that the people were immersed without bringing a second suit of clothes with them, we then reply that this by no means mends the matter. Many of John's converts came from Jerusalem, which was many miles dis-

tant from the Jordan, where he, we will suppose, immersed them all. Now, on this assumption, one or other of the following difficulties must have arisen. The people must have been dipped in their clothes or naked. If in the former state, then, of course, they must have had to walk or ride on their asses, or mules, or in their carriages, dripping with the water of Jordan, all the way back to the city, to the injury of their health and the amusement of those young people who were not believers or had never heard the preacher for themselves. But as we never read of the vulgar laugh at what must have been a curious novelty, according to our opponents' own showing, and as we have no account of the people contracting colds or rheumatisms from it, we conclude that this method was not adopted. If in the latter state, the mixed multitudes must have been plunged naked before each others faces—as private baptisms were then never practised. If our friends contend for this we shall let them. Observing, however, that if it were true, it supposes an indelicacy, especially in the case of ladies, of which they find no precedent or account in the word of God. Besides, this result is inevitable, that to baptize people now fully dressed is unapostolical, and, according to their principles, must be abandoned!

V. It is a remarkable circumstance, that in those baptisms which were administered in cities and houses (as nearly all Christian baptisms were), we never read that the minister or his converts went into, or down into, the water, or came out of, or up out of, the water—which would have been the case had they been submersed. When people were baptized in country places at rivers, brooks, or running streams, which are always in channels lower than the circumjacent land, it was necessary, for facilitating the ope-

ration, especially if many were baptized, or capacious vessels were not at hand to convey the element to a distant place, that they should go to, or down unto, the water for the reception of this rite—though they were only aspersed or affused with it. And thus much and no more the scriptures declare. But, if in house or city baptisms, the converts had been dipped, it would have been said they went into, or down into the pool, bath, or tank, and were submersed, and then came out, or up out, of the water—for going into, or down into the water, would have been as requisite for immersion in this case, as in the preceding, or as going down into a modern baptistry—yet this is no where recorded. Therefore, as the people must have gone down to the river for affusion—which they did—and as they must have gone down into the bath for immersion—which they did not—(the words of scripture being judge) we conclude that all were affused or aspersed, and none of them plunged. This exposition accounts for the different phraseology of the inspired writers, and harmonizes with the various narratives of scripture baptisms.

VI. It is also evident, that our Lord's forerunner and followers baptized all who were brought or made willing to submit to this sacrament. We read of no person being refused on account of age, sex, character, or circumstances. The Jewish nation, oppressed by the Roman yoke, and expecting a temporal deliverer in the Messiah, and supposing John to be this divine person (Luke iii. 15), they came to him and were consecrated unto his doctrine. John, however, having assured them that he was not the Christ, but that he was soon to appear—when, therefore, the Son of God commenced his ministry, they hastened to him and were consecrated unto his doctrine, even more numerously

than they had been unto John's. Now, it is said, that 'all the 'people were baptized' of John (Luke iii. 21); and that Christ, by his disciples, baptized more than he, (John iv. 1, 2.) Of all the multitudes that applied, we read of none that were refused. Certain Pharisees and lawyers, indeed, rejecting the counsel of God against themselves, would not submit (Luke vii. 30); but none who were disposed to comply were rejected. We may, therefore, conclude that, with very few exceptions, all the Jews were baptized. The exhortation which John gave to the people generally, and to the publicans and soldiers in particular (Luke iii. 11-14), in no wise militates against this assumption, since, without even a promise of compliance with his injunctions, they were all baptized, (Luke iii. 16.) Nor does the case of the three thousand who, after hearing Peter's sermon, were pricked to the heart, and gladly received the word preached to them (Acts ii. 37, 41); since it only proves how many were baptized and what means induced such a number to submit. There, however, is not a word about any being refused. Nor does that of Cornelius—since his first receiving, the Holy Ghost was evidently intended merely to remove the prejudice of Peter against admitting Gentiles into the visible church, (Acts x. 44-48.) Here, again, none are refused. The only passage exhibiting the appearance of terms or restrictions in baptizing, is the supposed question of the Eunuch and the answer of Philip, in Acts viii. 37; but which is almost universally allowed, by competent judges, to be an interpolation—and, therefore, ought not to be in the sacred writings.[1] In a word, we may defy our Baptist brethren to adduce a single instance where any persons applying for baptism for themselves, or for others,

[1] See Griesbach, Boothroyd, A. Clarke, &c. in Loc.

were refused. And as we have seen that all, with an inconsiderable exception, did apply—we say all, or nearly so, were actually baptized—some of them, probably, more than once or twice—first, by John (Luke iii. 21), then by our Lord's disciples, during his life-time (John iv. 1, 2); and again after his resurrection, (Acts xix. 3-5.) At least, a due consideration of these passages renders it likely. That all were not plunged under water appears to us unquestionable; and will be proved more at large under the next particular. We must now examine a few instances of scripture baptism, and we shall select those chiefly in which the circumstances of the administration are detailed, and on which the dipping hypothesis is mainly erected.

VII. The Ethiopian Eunuch, (Acts viii. 27-40.)—As this is a case on which our opponents lay the greatest stress in supporting their exclusive mode of baptism, and as it offers the only instance of *Christian* baptism in the New Testament, where the circumstances of the administration are largely noticed,[1] we have placed it first in our enumeration. It is roundly and repeatedly asserted that Philip put the Eunuch entirely under water. The grounds of this assertion, are the meaning of the terms employed, especially the prepositions *eis* and *ek*. In reply, we beg to offer the following remarks, to show that he was not immersed, but only affused or sprinkled by the deacon.

1. The Greek terms, as we have abundantly proved, are as favourable to our view of the case as to that of our opponents—the verb *baptizo* meaning to pour, sprinkle, or apply, the water, as well as to dip or immerse the body—and the prepositions *eis* and *ek*, implying no more than that they went to the water and returned from it. The first pre-

[1] Booth, vol. ii. p. 508.

position being translated *to* or *unto* five hundred and thirty-eight times in the New Testament, and the latter *from* one hundred and eighty-six times—this point is placed beyond debate. Dipping, therefore, cannot be established from the terms employed; while the circumstances, when duly weighed, make such an action highly improbable.

II. The place where this rite was administered, leads one to conclude that sprinkling or pouring was the method adopted. It is called a desert, (Acts viii. 36.) Now, a desert, according to the definition of one of our opponents, 'is a part of the earth little inhabited or manured, wanting 'pleasant rivers, elegant trees, fruits, &c.'[1] Hence the wonderful diffusion of gospel blessings, among heathen nations, is thus expressed by the prophet:—'In the wilder-'ness shall waters break out and streams in the desert.' (Is. xxxv. 6.) Had there been much water in this place, as the remark of Mr. Keach implies, it would have been cultivated, and not have remained a desert. We conclude, therefore, that the place was unfavourable to dipping. (See Ps. lxiii. 1.) This is corroborated by an historical fact. When Cambyses was about to invade Egypt, in the year 627, B.C. and had to pass this very spot or near it, 'he contracted 'with the Arabian king, that lay next the borders of Pa-'lestine and Egypt, to supply him with water while he 'passed the deserts that lay between these two countries; 'where accordingly it was brought on camels' backs; with-'out which he could not have marched his army that way.'[2] A parallel case is mentioned by the Jewish historian: When Cæsar was marching his army from Ptolemais to Pelusium, through the land of Judea, and probably by the rout partly taken by the Eunuch, it being a dry country, Herod sup-

[1] Keach's Met. p. 127. [2] Rollin's Anc. Hist. b. 4, c. 2.

plied it with water and other provisions thither and on its return, to the delight of Augustus.[1]

III. This water is also without a scripture name, while every material spring, fountain, or well of the Holy Land, has some significant appellation. The expression of the Eunuch is remarkable: 'See, water!' ('here is,' being in italics, and consequently not in the original), since it implies that it was approached without being distantly seen, and created a pleasing surprise in the traveller's mind. When we hear a Baptist bard chanting—

'The silver stream ran full in sight;'[2]

we can only smile at the simple fiction of his partial muse. It was probably either a well with a stone trough provided, as was common, by some philanthropist, to prevent travellers from perishing in their journeys through this dry and desert land;[3] or as Jerome, who lived many years in that neighbourhood, says, 'This water was a brook at the foot 'of Bethsur, or Bethsoron. We often pass over such little 'brooks in our common road.'[4]

IV. Let it be remarked further, that had Philip and the Eunuch gone down into the water and come up out of the water, it by no means proves that Philip immersed the black gentleman. Maclean says, 'we do not affirm that 'going down into the water is the same with baptism or im-'mersing. Philip and the Eunuch might go to their necks 'in water, and yet not be baptized.'[5] This is palpable, since Philip went into the water as well as the Eunuch, and yet was not baptized. This rite was something done

[1] Hist. Wars, b. 1, c. 20, s. 3. [2] Fellows, p. 28.
[3] Harmer's Obs. c. 5. obs. 5; and c. 9, obs. 52. [4] Script. Reasons, p. 65.
[5] V. iii. p. 118. See also Gill, p. 213.

while in the water, and perfectly irrespective of going into and coming out of it.

v. Besides, to say that they would not have gone into the water, had it not been for the purpose of dipping, is to base the immersion-scheme on a mere conjecture. We hesitate not to assert, that neither of them went into the water at all—let our opponents prove as well as assert the contrary, and then enlarge on the necessity of keeping close to the letter of scripture, and avoid all inferential reasonings. Further, might they not have gone into the water without either of them going under? Have not our brethren done so frequently? Is it not done every day of our lives? Might they not have gone into the water up to their ancles or knees, and then might not the deacon have poured or sprinkled some on the head or face of the Eunuch? Nor would this kind of consecration have surprised the Chancellor, as being an unscriptural or a new-fangled method. He had been reading just before this sentence: 'So shall 'he sprinkle many nations' (Is. lii. 15):—a sprinkling, therefore, was what he might have expected—probably the very expressions led him to solicit baptism. With this species of purification also, as a proselyte of Judaism, he must have been perfectly familiar; whereas the action of one man putting another under water, was a thing he had never before seen or heard of, and what therefore he was very unlikely to solicit.

vi. To contend that the Eunuch had water enough in his chariot for a sprinkling, is all imagination.[1] Our opponents might as well conclude he had enough for his numerous retinue, with which they are pleased to honour him, and for his several horses; and that he enjoyed the cooling

[1] Jenkins's Def. p. 119; Ryland, p. 11.

gratification of riding amidst leathern bottles of this element —sitting as stately as Neptune upon the waves! There is no intimation that he had even any, and therefore if only a few drops were required, they must go where it was to be obtained—nor is there a word said about his having a jug to fetch any in. Our friends, who object to inference in other cases, are pleased to avail themselves of it here by wholesale. They also forget in this place what they have repeatedly told us, that pure, fair, or running water, or, as Josephus says, 'water taken from perpetual springs,'[1] was always essential to Jewish consecrations and Christian baptism. Dr. Gill, however, tells us, that wine and water, mixed, was the usual drink of those countries;[2] and if this were mixed before-hand, as is most probable, it would have been quite unfit for baptism. Consequently, whatever he might have had in his warm leathern bottles was no more fit for this sacrament than if it had, by a miracle, been all turned into wine.

VII. But there is another insurmountable objection to the dipping of the Eunuch—namely, the inconveniency and indelicacy of its accompaniments. This black Chancellor must have been either dipped in his travelling dress and have rode on his way rejoicing, saturated to the skin, with the water running about his carriage, to the injury of all its appurtenances and to the endangering of his life—which no person in his senses will believe; or he must have been baptized naked before a large retinue of servants, which our opponents, as before remarked, are pleased to place about his highness;[3] or, lastly, he must have shifted his clothes twice, and have been in a state of nudity twice before his attendants. Dr. Jenkins tells us, though not from his own

[1] Ant. b. 3, c. 9, s. 1. [2] P. 459. [3] Jenkins's Def. p. 119.

knowledge, that his servants helped him 'to change his 'raiment, took notice of the whole transaction; and their 'curiosity excited enquiry about the liberties taken by 'Philip.'[1] Now, that a black man—for he was an Ethiopian (Acts viii. 27)—and one of a nation celebrated for the darkness of their skin (Jer. xiii. 23)—a gentleman, a chancellor—and, above all, a eunuch—should have done all this, and that we should be called to believe it, without the least scripture authority, exceeds all our credulity. We therefore unhesitatingly conclude, that he was not put under water, but that he was baptized by affusion or aspersion. The leading terms of the narrative are in perfect unison with this interpretation; and the circumstances of the case must place this view of the subject beyond all doubt in every ingenuous mind.

VIII. The blessed Redeemer, (Matt. iii. 13-16; Mark i. 9, 10; Luke iii. 21-23.)—It is strongly contended that our Lord was put under water by John the Baptist. This is advocated from the supposed sense of the word baptize, the meaning of a Greek preposition, and the circumstances of the case. A few considerations will show the fallacy of all these testimonies.

1. The terms will not prove it. *Baptizo*, as we have amply established, meaning either to dip or pour, immerse or sprinkle—and can be interpreted only by the connexion. It is not said our Saviour went into the water; but this is assumed by the expression he came up out of the water. It should, however, be remembered that the Greek preposition *apo*, in Matt. iii. 16, is translated *from* three hundred and seventy-four times, and *out of* only forty-six times, in the New Testament; and that one of our most learned oppo-

[1] Ib. p. 120.

nents has observed that it might be generally, if not always, thus rendered.[1] Consequently, we can derive no satisfactory evidence as to the mode of our Lord's baptism from the leading terms of the narrative; and therefore shall not conclude that he was plunged under water until our brethren have adduced some more convincing evidence.

II. But even admitting that our Lord did go into the water, and, while in it, was baptized by John, can our brethren tell us how it was done? A total submersion of the body does not necessarily follow a mere immersion of the feet and legs. The ancient carved and sculptured representations of baptism, as given by Robinson[2] and Taylor,[3] place the candidates sometimes in the water and sometimes not, while the officer appears pouring the element on his head, in the character of anointing or consecrating to office. This method, in respect of adults, is still adopted in the Greeek church. Nor would such a previous walking into the edge of a river be thought any thing very significant in a country where the people, as Matthew Henry says, 'went 'bare-legged.' Going into the water, or being put into it, as practised by infants in the Greek and other eastern churches, is only a preparatory rite, in the form of ablution, and not baptism itself, which consits in a subsequent pouring or sprinkling. But we say there is not a particle of solid proof that our Lord went into the water at all—and consequently none that he came absolutely out of it. He went to the water necessarily; for John was baptizing with the running stream, and when some of it had been poured on his head, he immediately retired.

III. But we have internal evidence that John baptized our Lord by pouring or sprinkling. 'The harbinger,' says

[1] Ryland's App. p. 28. [2] Hist. plates. [3] Letter 1st, plates.

Mr. Taylor 'was informed that Jesus baptized, and all 'men came to him, (John iii. 34.) Part of his answer is, "He whom God hath sent, speaketh the words of God; for "God giveth not the spirit out of a measure *(ek metrou)* unto "him," as water is given at baptism by his forerunner to 'those upon whom it is poured. And this is fixed to the 'subject of baptism, by the occasion of the story, which was 'a question of debate between the disciples of John and cer-'tain Jews about ritual purification. To no other period of 'our Lord's life, than his baptism, could these words spoken 'by John refer in those early days of his ministry, when he 'had as yet done comparatively nothing; and what but the 'action of giving could recall, by association of ideas, the Baptist's mind to the recollection of giving out of a measure ?'[1]

iv. It may tend further to confirm our view of the Saviour's baptism, if we remark that Aaron and his sons, being types of our Lord in his priestly office, were, as such, baptized by Moses.[2] The elements employed were three—water (Lev. viii. 6), oil (v. 12), and blood, (v. 23, 24.) The mode of application, in the first instance, as we have already proved, was pouring or sprinkling—in the second, it was pouring only—and, in the third, it was staining, or applying a colour. As the anti-type of all this, our Lord was baptized with water by John (Matt. iii. 13); with an unction by the Father (Is. lxi. 1; Luke iii. 23); and with blood by his enemies, (Luke xii. 50.) In reference to this three-fold element of baptism, it is said, 'this is he 'that came by water and blood, even Jesus Christ; and 'there are three that bear witness in earth—the Spirit, (or 'unction,) and the water, and the blood—and these agree

[1] Taylor, Lett. 1st, p 37, 38. [2] Keach's Met. p. 348.

'in one,' (1 John v. 6, 8.) Now, as the consecration of the type was, in every instance, by applying the element to the object, it is but fair to infer, without valid reasons to the contrary, that this of the anti-type was similar. Indeed, we are certain, that Christ was baptized with the Spirit and blood, by pouring or applying the elements—and have no hesitation in concluding that the water of baptism was brought in contact with his sacred person in a similar manner.

v. Moreover, as in the case of the Eunuch and of all others baptized in the open air, if the principles of our opponents are correct, our Lord must have been dipped naked, and stood exposed to the multitude present all the time—or he must have been dipped in his ordinary apparel, and, dripping with water, must have retired to his lodgings, which were probably distant—or he must have changed his clothes, and thereby have exposed his sacred person twice—before and after the immersion. And if this occurred in the month of November, as one of our opponents believes, and if the weather at that season of the year is sometimes as wet and as cold in Judea, as it is in this country;[1] the evil must have been greatly augmented, and the probability of his being immersed very much diminished. These are difficulties which are insurmountable. The indelicacy of the case is so at all events. Besides it does not appear that our Lord had a change of raiment, at least, with him. In fact, circumstances lead us to conclude, he had only one suit in the world—and therefore the usual plea of taking a second dress is unavailing here. (See Luke ix. 3; Matt. xxvii. 35.) Upon the whole, we have no hesitation in saying that the Saviour was affused or sprinkled by the Baptist, and not dipped at all.

[1] Gibbs, p. 176.

VI. Presuming this deduction to be correct, it must appear evident, that for our opponents to be continually telling their ignorant hearers, who feel a little reluctant to be popped under water, that, unless they submit to it like Christ, they will not fulfil all righteousness—is to produce an inference without premises, and an argument without a foundation; since Christ was never dipped at all in baptism. Besides, to fulfil all righteousness, the Son of God was circumcised when eight days old, regularly kept the passover, and observed all the other Jewish institutions—to fulfil all righteousness like Christ, therefore our brethren should do the same. Even in baptism, the case, on their own showing, was singular. He was baptized without saving faith, or repentance, or any recorded answer of a good conscience. To follow his example fully, none should be dipped till they are thirty years of age—and a river, if not the Jordan, should always be the place of administration. Perhaps, our opponents, who make the supposed immersion of Christ a topic of such universal application, can tell us into what name Christ was baptized, and what was the form of words used on that interesting occasion?

IX. CORNELIUS AND HIS FAMILY. The account is related in ACTS X. 44-48, on which we shall be rather concise.

1. We remark that there is something significant in the expression of Peter: 'Who can forbid water?' But is ever such language used in reference to dipping in a brook or a baptistry? It is, however, very appropriate, when applied to a servant's bringing some in a vessel, as is done in our administration of this rite. There is, also, another circumstance in this transaction of a most decisive character. When Peter saw the Holy Ghost descend in a visible manner, on the centurion and his family, as he fell upon the disciples on

the day of Pentecost, he immediately concluded that they might be baptized with water, (Acts xi. 15, compare Acts ii. 3.) This ostensible outpouring of the Spirit brought to his recollection the words of Christ respecting the baptism of John. Hear his language:—'And as I 'began to speak, the Holy Ghost fell on them as on us at 'the beginning: then remembered I the words of the Lord 'how he said, John indeed baptized with water, but ye 'shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost.' (Acts xi. 15, 16, compare Acts i. 5.) But whence could arise this instantaneous association in the apostle's mind, on the system of our opponents? What resemblance was there to create such an idea, if John immersed all the people? Are any two acts more directly opposite than the descent of the Spirit on the heads of a family, and plunging such a family into a river? That the Spirit descended, we know—it being a fact universally admitted; but what intimation was this to Peter that the people should therefore be dipped? Supposing, however, that water-baptism, as administered by John and the apostles of Christ, was by causing the element to descend upon them out of the hand or out of a measure, the whole narrative becomes consistent and natural? You will also observe that the outpouring of the Spirit and baptism by water are denominated one and the same thing, and are so blended in this narrative, that it is impossible to conclude that they were not precisely similar in action. Hence we conclude that both were by an affusion or an aspersion.

11. Here it may not be out of place to observe, that the case of Cornelius affords us the only instance where it is said the Holy Spirit was given to persons previous to water-baptism. For this extraordinary method a reason may be

found in the reluctance of Peter to receive into the visible communion of the church any who were recognized as Gentiles. Most of his colleagues were infected with a similar prejudice, (Acts xi. 1-3.) To remove this impression and to justify his proceeding, the Spirit was poured out in his presence, and fully satisfied his scrupulous conscience. Nor should it be forgotten, that the baptism of believers, as contended for by our opponents, and of believers and their seed, as advocated by many Pedobaptists, is no doctrine of the New Testament. That real believers and their seed were baptized, we do not question; but we do deny that it was confined to them. In the case of adults 'conviction of the truth of the report' necessarily preceded baptism —since none would have been baptized without it. But that the apostle looked for real conversion or regeneration, as a necessary qualification for the reception of this ordinance, we deny—and, were it within the range of our present investigation, we could easily disprove. The New Testament baptisms were never deemed a test of character, but only an exhibition of grace and truth. The illustration and confirmation of this sentiment we trust soon to witness from the pen of a gentleman pre-eminently competent to do it ample justice.

X. The Samaritans, Paul and the Jailor.—These baptisms, to instance no others, are all so circumstanced, as to force the conclusion that they were not dipped, but simply affused or sprinkled. As these cases involve nothing very material to this part of our enquiry, we have placed them together, and shall treat them but briefly.

1. *The Samaritans*, (Acts viii. 10-12.) Of these it is manifest that a great number was baptized. It will also be recollected that pure or running water, or such as had not

been polluted by natural or moral defilement, was necessary in every individual baptism. Now, if the candidates had been all dipped, at least three hogsheads of water were requisite for each full-grown person, and no small quantity for the little folks. Let it, however, be remarked, that the term Samaria, in the time of Christ and afterwards, meant a country and not a city.[1] The words of Luke, in Acts viii. 5, are literally, 'Then Philip went 'down to *a* city of Samaria.'[2] This is supposed to have been the ancient Sechem or Sychar where, about five years before, our Lord and his disciples had spent two days, (John iv. 5, 40.) Assuming this to be the truth, we may derive circumstantial evidence in support of our scheme. Now Sychar, like the city of Nahor, (Gen. xxiv. 11, 13, 43), Ramah (1 Sam. ix. 11), and other towns erected in the neighbourhood of wells or fountains, and generally on elevated ground, was supplied with pure water from Jacob's well, which was distant from the city and of considerable depth, (John iv. 27.) That water sufficient for immersing all these Samaritans, 'from the least 'to the greatest,' was not fetched on this occasion, we may fairly infer, and therefore conclude that the people were baptized in the usual way by pouring or sprinkling. This assumption renders all the circumstances of the case feasible and consistent; and though the identity of this city may be disputed, yet there can hardly be a question that the many who believed in our Lord on his visit to this place, were baptized immediately on believing the truth of his report; when the difficulties of immersion would have been nearly as great as in the present instance.

II. *The Apostle Paul*, (Acts ix. 8-19.)—That this per-

[1] Calmet's Dict. in Loc. [2] Comp. Bible in Loc.

son, after the exhaustion of three days fasting, blindness, and unparalleled perturbation of mind, should, without some specific command of God, which was not given, have been plunged naked or dressed into a river or reservoir of cold water in the depth of Winter (25th of January), before he ate a morsel of victuals, is what few will be credulous enough to conclude. It would have partaken of so much inconsideration and even of cruelty, that Ananias certainly would not have done it without an especial injunction, which, as said before, was never given to him. It is particularly said that he was to arise or stand up to be baptized—a mode of expression every way unsuitable to the action of dipping—for which a person should rather have lain down or inclined towards the 'liquid grave.' Upon the whole we infer, that the apostle was baptized by sprinkling or pouring. In this case the ceremony would have consumed but a very short period, would not have added to Paul's consternation, already overwhelming, and in fact would have comported with all the requisites of the original institution and practice.

III. *The Philippian Jailor*, (Acts xvi. 25-34.) That this man 'and all his,' were plunged by Paul or Silas, appears very improbable. He had heard the apostles converse about Christ perhaps half an hour, and that at midnight. He then 'disturbed the sweet repose'[1] of his wife and children, who had long been with him in bed—got them out of their rooms—and they were baptized the very same hour. If they were baptized by dipping, it was either in a bath, as Dr. Ryland supposes,[2] or in a neighbouring river, as Dr. Jenkins imagines.[3] That there was no

[1] Booth, vol. i. p. 25. [2] Bapt. Mag. Jan. 1814.
[3] Jenkin's Defence, p. 119.

bath in this eastern prison for the purpose of washing the prisoners on entering, may be inferred from the fact, that Paul and Silas had been sent to their cells without the advantage of it. And the improbability of the whole posting off in the dark to some neighbouring river with second suits of clothes on their arms, has been exhibited before. In fact, no one would have fancied they were immersed whose mind had not been prejudiced greatly in favour of dipping. As our's has not been, we assume that the Jailor and his family were baptized by affusion or aspersion. This conclusion renders the detail of St. Luke harmonious and natural.

XI. We have now mentioned all the cases in which the circumstances of scripture baptism are more or less narrated, and feel no question but that we have your verdict in favour of our deductions. In examining this subject, you perceive that we have taken broad and extensive grounds of argumentation, as the only valid method of properly eliciting the facts of the case. Our opponents, however, in maintaining their point, are very much limited in their data. One of them has stated, in a very few words, the entire basis of their system:—'The acceptation of the Greek 'word—the circumstances of our Lord's baptism (MATT. 'iii. 16)—and those of the Eunuch (ACTS viii. 38, 39) '—as also the allusions, in ROM. vi. 3, 4, and COL. ii. 12, 'to a burial and resurrection.'[1]—And this, in fact, is the whole. How far it will support their cause, we leave you to judge. That a shadow of evidence cannot be obtained from any of them, we think has been sufficiently established —nor do we remember a case of immersion-baptism mentioned in all the compass of the Old or New Testaments.

[1] Maclean, v. iii. p. 21.

SECTION FIFTH.

THE NUMBERS BAPTIZED BY JOHN AND THE APOSTLES.

Under the last particular it was observed, that none who desired to receive baptism by the forerunner or followers of Christ were ever refused—that no conditions were made likely to restrict the applicants to any considerable amount—and that several circumstances conspired to induce the people *en masse* to apply first to John for baptism and then to Christ. This being assumed, we purpose now to show that the numbers consecrated by John during the period he preceded Christ as a minister of religion, and by the disciples of our Lord on the day of Pentecost and subsequently, were, on account of their numbers, not submersed, but simply affused or sprinkled. We shall begin with,—

I. THE BAPTISM OF JOHN.—'Then went to him Jeru-'salem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jor-'dan. and were baptized of him in (or on) the Jordan, 'confessing their sins,' (MATT. iii. 5, 6. See MARK i. 5.) As you have repeatedly heard, it is a principle with our opponents, in positive institutions, not to reason, infer, or analogize on the Word of God, but to take it literally, and understand it as plain people do, in its grammatical sense and according to our vernacular translation—since they argue, that otherwise common readers of the Bible would be obliged to pin their faith on the sleeve of their teacher. To pass over the difficulties which such a mode of understanding the Holy Oracles would create at every step, and here in particular, and to take our friends on tolerably fair grounds, we will suppose with our plain fellow-countrymen, that all or nearly all the people, old and young of

course, living in Jerusalem and Judea, and in the region or countries round about Jordan, were baptized of John by total immersion in the river of Jordan, just as it is practised by our brethren in Great Britain. On this conjecture two or three enquiries may be raised:—

1. Whether John alone administered this sacrament, or whether he was assisted in it by his disciples? To this we reply, that there is no more express account of John's being aided in this operation by his followers, than there is of infants being baptized by him—nor yet half so much—for we may from the terms employed infer, that he did the latter, but no intimation is given of the former. There is not, however, any circumstance which indicates that John was aided in his work by his disciples; and unless our friends have recourse to supposition and induction, which they deny us in similar cases, because fatal to their scheme, they are forced to conclude, that he, single-handed, baptized all the multitudes that came to him, (Luke iii. 7.) Further, when the comparative numbers of those baptized by Christ and John are mentioned, it is said, 'Jesus bap-'tized not, but his disciples.' And this is adduced to account for his consecrating more than John, (John iv. 1, 2.) This reasoning, however, would have been invalid, had John been assisted by his disciples. Besides, what Mr. Booth says on another occasion cannot be inapplicable here. 'It is plain,' says he,[1] 'that this language (Gen. 'xvii. 23,) ascribes to Abraham the whole performance of 'this rite, exclusive of any assistant; for it was the pa-'triarch himself who *took* Ishmael and *every male* in his 'own house, and circumcised them. That all this was 'performed by Abraham in one day, we have no doubt,

[1] Vol. i. p. 253.

'because the facts rest upon divine testimony.' This point we shall therefore consider established.

II. The next question is, How long was John employed in baptizing this immense number? You will bear in mind that all these people are said to have been baptized prior to the baptism of Christ. 'Now when all the people 'were baptized, it came to pass that Jesus also being 'baptized, and praying, the heaven was opened, &c.' (LUKE iii. 21.) In MATT. iii. 5, 6, and MARK i. 5, it is expressly said that all the inhabitants of Jerusalem, Judea, and the region round about Jordan, were baptized before our Lord visited the Baptist. It should be further remembered that John was the son of a priest (LUKE i. 5), and consequently a priest himself, (NUMB, xvi. 40.) Now as such he could not have entered his priestly office, part of which, as we have seen, was baptizing, till he was thirty years of age, (NUMB. iv. 3-47; 1 CHRON. xxiii. 3.) In this opinion we are supported by the declaration of a celebrated opponent, who says, 'When John was about thirty 'years of age, in obedience to the heavenly call, he entered 'on his ministry.'[1] Now, as said before, all, or nearly all, these people were baptized previous to the baptism of Christ, who, 'when he began to be about thirty years of age (LUKE iii. 23), was baptized by his harbinger. But John was only six months older than our blessed Saviour (LUKE i. 36), therefore all this work was done in about the space of six months. This position we shall also deem valid.

III. The third question is, How many did John baptize? This, indeed, cannot be answered precisely: but if we may avail ourselves of the best information to be obtained, as

[1] Rob. p. 2.

our opponents do in similar cases, John must have baptized an immense number: the inhabitants of Jerusalem, Judea, and all the region round about Jordan were baptized. Now we learn, from good authority, that about forty years after, and subsequent to a long series of oppressions by the Romans, after much intestine warfare, and doubtless many emigrations to distant places, when Titus besieged Jerusalem, 1,100,000 persons were slain in this city alone, nearly 300,000 perished in other parts of the country, and about 100,000 were carried away captive by the conquerors; the Christians, who were very numerous, according to our Lord's direction (Luke xxi. 21), escaped the catastrophe by a seasonable flight;[1] and no inconsiderable number remained still in the land, and who in the reign of Adrian, on account of a furious revolt, were slaughtered to the number of 500,000; multitudes were sold as slaves, and others were banished from the land.[2] Whence we may reasonably conclude, that at the time John was baptizing, Jerusalem, Judea, and the region round about Jordan, comprehended, at least, 2,000,000 of inhabitants. Nor is this computation taken from profane authors in any degree incompatible with the statements of scripture. In the time of David, there were in Israel 1,100,000 men of war above twenty years of age, and in Judah 470,000; the tribes of Levi and Benjamin not being numbered, (1 Chron. xxi. 5.) Jeroboam, king of Israel, brought 800,000 men against Abijah, king of Judah, who met him with 400,000, (2 Chron. xiii. 3); and Asa's army, composed of the tribes of Judah and Benjamin, consisted of 580,000 soldiers, (2 Chron. xiv. 8.) And though

[1] Newton on the Proph. Disc. 20, p. 41. Ed. Lond. 1823.
[2] Adam's Rel. W. Displayed, v. ii. p. 284.

these are the numbers before the captivity, yet when it is considered that not only a large portion of the tribes of Judah and Benjamin returned to Judea, but also of the other ten tribes (Acts xxvi. 7; Jas. i. 1), we may fairly conclude, that after a lapse of five hundred years, the Jews, then so called, were as numerous as the tribes of Judah and Benjamin had ever been; and which, upon a moderate calculation, could not have been less than 2,000,000 of people, as before supposed. Indeed the Jews present at the Passover, in the year 65, were 3,000,000;[1] and a little later, a still greater number had congregated in the metropolis on a similar occasion;[2] which would make the total amount at least 4,000,000, double the number before assumed. However, as many of these probably came from distant countries, let us suppose that 2,000,000 of people came under the influence of John's baptism.

All these, then, according to the letter of the sacred historian, and according to the literal mode of interpretation adopted by our brethren, were baptized by immersion, during the space of six months, by the single-handed efforts of John the Baptist. We have said 2,000,000, for the sake of round numbers; the few individuals who would not submit, and others who might not have applied, or were baptized at Enon afterwards, are not sufficient to affect the argument founded on this calculation.

iv. Now, the fourth question is, Whether this was practicable? You will observe, that John had to preach, travel, repose, and take refreshment, during this period, as well as to plunge the people. Nor have we any account of his being a man of more than ordinary vigour of constitution or muscular strength of body, neither do we learn that

[1] Hist. of the Wars, b. 2, c. 14, s. 3. [2] Ib. b. 6. c. 9, s. 3.

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the people dipped were less robust or more easily managed than the generality of candidates for immersion in the present day. Suppose, then, we take the numbers for granted, and conclude that John actually baptized them all. In that case, he must have stood in the water up to his knees or middle, from morning till night, for the full space of six months, and must have plunged over head and ears and pulled up again about 12,800 every day, sabbaths excepted—about 1,070 every hour, and nearly 18 every minute! That all this was impossible, we need not argue—every child present must perceive it.

v. But lest it should be thought we had formed our basis of argumentation on too large a scale, we will, with Dr. Cox, consider the language as expressive of an indefinite number, though comprehending 'great multitudes.'[1] We will, then, suppose that John baptized but the *tenth* of the probable inhabitants of the country; and surely this cannot be considered an extravagant calculation. We will also suppose that all were adults, men and women, giving themselves up to the discipleship of the Baptist. To have accomplished this, he must have stood in the water twelve hours every day for six months, sabbaths excepted, and have dipped over head and ears and pulled up again 1,280 between the rising and setting sun—about 107 every hour—and nearly 2 every minute. The difficulty of doing this must be apparent on more accounts than one:—His garments must have rotted—his saturated flesh must have peeled from his bones—and the cold water must, without a miracle, have caused a fatal rush of blood to his head. But let us refer to numbers. Now, as this reasoning rests on facts and experience rather than theoretical calculation, let us hear

[1] P. 113.

the decisions of practical men:—Dr. Jenkins says, that 'any man of common strength and alertness might dip 'thirty-seven in two hours.'[1]—Mr. Burt is very bold and saith, 'I question not but one minister may, with the bless-'ing of God, immerge in the sacred names used in baptism, 'and raise again from the water, fifty in an hour for five 'hours successively; and that he would find a vast deal of 'pleasure therein.'[2] Of course Mr. Burt means in this conjecture, for it is nothing more, that the blessing of God includes some extraordinary, if not miraculous, assistance. Nor did he probably contemplate that the minister might ever be a little weak brother and his subjects very large and weighty. But, after all, this would be only a trifle compared with the labours of 'poor John the Dipper!'

VI. We may, however, be questioned in return, Whether the baptism of so many people, in so short a time, by a single individual, would have been practicable on the supposition, that they were all baptized by affusion or aspersion, as administered by the great body of Christians in the present day? We answer in the affirmative, for the case has been demonstrated. Dr. Robertson, in his History of America, tells us, that 'a single clergyman, in one 'day, baptized 5,000 Mexicans.'[3]—Mr. Robinson, in his History of Baptism, says, that 'in the font of the Vatican 'Church at Rome, Pope Liberius, on a holy Saturday bap-'tized, of both sexes and of different ranks, 8,810 cate-'chumens.'[4]—Pope Gregory says, as cited by the last historian, that 'Austin baptized more than 10,000 persons 'in England on a Christmas day;'[5] and, according to Mr. Booth, Francis Xavier, a missionary among the In-

[1] C. R. p. 58. [2] Treatise, p. 22. [3] Works, v. iv. p. 56.
[4] P. 112. [5] P. 116.

dians, baptized 15,000 of them in one day.[1] Admitting the truth of these statements, two things are manifest, our opponents being umpires of the question,[2] that neither the clergyman, Liberius, Austin, nor Xavier, baptized by immersion; and secondly, that John could have baptized all we have supposed with perfect ease by pouring or sprinkling.

VII. But we have said John was a Jewish priest, as Zacharias was before him. Now as our opponents positively deny the existence of proselyte baptism before his day,[3] the only baptism which God had appointed under the law to be performed by the ministers of religion on the candidates for purification or consecration, was pouring, sprinkling, or applying the element—this we have proved from scripture and the declarations of our opponents. You have seen that the congregation was sprinkled *en masse*, or the water was aspersed upon them as a body. This mode our opponents affect to ridicule when advocated by modern commentators as likely to have been adopted by John in respect of the multitudes he baptized.[4] But they should bear in mind that Aaron and every high, and probably every inferior priest, did the like at God's command, for a purpose avowedly similar to those of a New Testament baptism. Nor are we aware that there is any thing more laughable in it than there is in a young preacher of modern times dipping the folks by dozens in a river or baptistry.

VIII. It may be also proper here to notice, that we have no fresh specification of the mode of baptism in the writings of the Evangelists; consequently we must infer that it was to be done as appointed by Moses. Nor could John, without injunctions unknown to us, and on which, of course,

[1] Vol. i. p. 255. [2] *Supra*. [3] Booth, v. ii. p. 162-197.
[4] Ibid. v. i, p. 237-247.

we cannot reason, have acted differently from his predecessors; and yet he received the sanction of the Saviour. The great numbers initiated by him, and the more full development of the original design of this institution, by no means affect the mode of his operations. This method was divinely appointed (Heb. ix. 10), and consequently came from heaven (Matt. xxi. 25), with all the doctrines and duties which the precursor of the Messiah delivered and inculcated, and which, rather than the manner of his consecration, was evidently intended by baptism in the last-cited passage.[1] If there were any alterations introduced, it devolves on our brethren to prove it: and as they talk and write so largely on positive precepts as well as apostolical examples, let them adduce their warrantry for changing the mode of baptism current for at least fifteen hundred years. But as this is impossible, they must allow us to assume that it was never altered, and that John sprinkled the people as his forefathers had done in their generations.

ix. But still it may be objected that John's baptism was an entirely new ordinance peculiar to the age and occasion of his ministry, and that any reference to the Mosaic rites cannot fairly illustrate the manner of its administration. For this purpose Matt. xxi. 25, is cited:—'The 'baptism of John, whence was it, from heaven or of men?' or is it an institution of God or the invention of mortals? This question the persons addressed were unable or unwilling to answer—so that the passage does not prove it to be of human or divine origin exclusively. We will, however, admit that this was from heaven. (See John iii. 31.) But then the language does not determine whether it was the result of an entirely new revelation of God to John,

[1] See Gill, p. 212.

specifying the subjects, mode, and design of the ceremony, or the adoption of a religious ordinance long before in use among the Jews. The doctrines he preached were as much from heaven as the rite he administered, and were probably included in the term baptism; but they had been revealed and promulgated during many preceding generations. The present ministry of the gospel is unquestionably from heaven, though instituted eighteen hundred years ago. The phrase from heaven, signifies only of divine origination. (See Rom. i. 18; Jas. i. 17; Rev. iii. 12.) We have no positive precept or apostolic testimony that it was a new thing in the earth when John entered on his mission; nor is he said to have introduced it as a religious service among the Jews. And even had this been the case, it would not have disproved its prior observance. Moses is said to have given circumcision to the Hebrews (John vii. 22), though it had been administered hundreds of years before among the progenitors of that chosen people. He merely, at the command of God, adopted it among his Levitical institutes as he found it among the Hebrew tribes. Consequently the question proposed—even conceding a reply, as before suggested—in no degree affects the arguments previously given. It might have come from heaven long before John was born—when administered by him so extensively, might be called his baptism, as sacrificial offerings are designated the laws of Moses; and, in its general design, the character of its subjects, and the mode of its performance, might perfectly harmonize with the typical purifications, initiations, or consecrations under the Mosaic economy.

x. Here it may not be irrelevant to our object to observe, that the Disciples of St. John the Baptist, a sect residing in

the East, have perpetuated or adopted a plan of baptizing which corroborates our position—that John acted in conformity with the supposed customs of the Jewish priests. These people reiterate, in a solemn and public manner, the mode of John's baptism once a year. The following is Norberg's account:—'On the day when John instituted 'his baptism, they repeat this sacred ordinance. They 'proceed in a body to the water, and among them one who 'bears a standard; also the priest, dressed in his camel's 'hair ornaments, holding a vessel of water in his hand, he 'sprinkles each person singly as he comes out of the river, 'saying, I renew your baptism in the name of our father 'and saviour John, who, in this manner, baptized the 'Jews in the Jordan and saved them: he shall save you 'also.—Last of all, he immerges himself in the water for 'his own salvation.'[1]—Here we have the people in the water before their baptism and the priest after—while the only transitive act is sprinkling, which is alone designated the baptism. Mr. Wolfe, the missionary, found a people in Mesopotamia, who also call themselves The Followers of John the Baptist. 'The priests or bishops baptize child-'ren thirty days old. They take the child to the brink of 'the river—a relative or friend holds the child near the sur-'face of the water, while the priest *sprinkles* the element 'upon it.'[2]—We do not lay much stress on these customs. However, they may be considered as neutralizing similar evidence adduced by our opponents; and they prove, as Mr. Watson justly remarks, 'that we have, in modern 'times, river-baptism without immersion.'[3]

II. The Baptism of the Three Thousand on the

[1] Calmet's Dict. in Loc. [2] Journal, v. ii. p. 311.
[3] Institutes, v. iii. p. 438.

Day of Pentecost.—That these people were baptized by pouring or sprinkling, and not by dipping or immersing, will be rendered plain from the following considerations:

1. The time occupied in baptizing them was too limited. On the most liberal calculations, the apostles could not have begun to baptize till the middle of the day. Peter did not commence his sermon to the multitude till the third hour of the day, or about nine o'clock according to our reckoning, (Acts ii. 15.) His discourse, of which Luke has given us an outline in the second chapter of the Acts, was evidently protracted and elaborate. Then there was time employed in the subsequent enquiries and responses —in explaining the design of this ordinance and all the preparations for it—which would have consumed little short of three hours; and as night came on, about six o'clock in the evening, when we may suppose they would have been arrested in their operations, they could have had no more than about six hours in which to perform this ceremony; or, as Mr. Burt's calculations intimate, only five hours were consumed in the administration.[1] For the sacred historian renders it plain, that they were initiated into the church on the very day of their conviction (Acts ii. 41); and as our brethren assure us, that 'baptism in scripture 'always preceded adding to a visible church,'[2] and that 'the 'apostolic churches were composed of baptized believers, 'and none ever admitted to their communion who had not 'been baptized'[3]—we are necessitated to conclude that the three thousand were, in this manner, initiated into the church at Jerusalem in the afternoon of the day of Pentecost.

11. Let us suppose, then, that all these people had been

[1] Treatise, p. 22. [2] Maclean, v. iii. p. 256. [3] Gibbs, p. 12.

baptized by the twelve apostles alone—for this is the more probable interpretation—two hundred and fifty persons would have fallen to the lot of each administrator, who, on the principle of our opponents, must have immersed about forty-two per hour during six hours successively, or fifty per hour during five hours without intermission, at every immersion pronouncing the sacred names used in baptism — a task, no doubt, very laborious, and performed but with immense pains and assiduity. There must also have been twelve distinct places or accommodations for this baptizing, which we shall presently show you were not easily procurable in Jerusalem, especially by the disciples, who were almost universally detested, and whose converts, being mostly visitors during the feast of Pentecost (Acts ii. 8-11), could have commanded no private or public conveniences for such an immersing.

III. If it be asserted, though it cannot be proved, that the seventy brethren assisted the twelve apostles,[1] we reply that while this proportionably diminishes the manual labour of each within the compass of practicability, allotting but thirty-six candidates to each dipper, it greatly enhances the difficulty in another respect, since not less than eighty-two convenient if not distinct places suitable to such an occasion must have been obtained under all the inauspicious circumstances mentioned before. That is, eighty-two places containing fair and pure water sufficiently large and deep for dipping men and women with despatch and delicacy, must have been provided immediately, and on the spot, by the poor persecuted disciples and their equally detested, if not anathematized, converts, in the city of Jerusalem. The insuperable obstacles to the accomplishment of which must strike the dullest mind in this congregation.

[1] Jenkin's Def. p. 119; J. Stennett, p. 123.

iv. But this dipping of the three thousand, was a small part of the business to be performed in five or six hours. If our opponents' prerequisites to baptism are scriptural, the apostles must have examined the fitness of all these candidates for the reception of this rite, and which, according to modern practice, must have consumed thrice the time requisite for their immersion. This labour must have been greatly enhanced by the circumstance, that the apostles knew little or nothing of their moral character previously, except that they had by their vote at least become the murderers of the Holy One and the Just; and which was no great recommendation in their favour.[1] To reply that as a multitude thy gave sufficient evidence of genuine conversion to God, will avail nothing; since a crowd, exclaiming under a sermon from a Baptist brother, 'men and brethren what shall we do?' would not satisfy his mind that they were, according to his hypothesis of believers' baptism, proper subjects for this ordinance, nor would he know in the confusion of the outcry who had absolutely offered the supplication. No, he would examine them at length, one by one; and as he acts on apostolical example, he must conclude that Peter and his colleagues did the same. Nor would it avail our opponents to say that the apostles, because able to discern the spirits which influenced false teachers, (1 Cor. xii. 10), were able to determine intuitively the spiritual state of these three thousand; since what they did in this respect, all believers are to do, (1 Jn. iv. 1),[2] since they were often mistaken, as in the case of Simon Magus, and since God alone can read the heart, (1 Kings viii. 39.) In fact this point is conceded by our

[1] Booth, vol. i. p. 256.

[2] Dr. Pye Smith's Messiah, vol. iii. p. 175-178.

brethren.[1] Consequently the apostles had to catechise these three thousand people individually and minutely on their change of heart, knowledge of the gospel, moral character, purity of motives, grounds of hope and the like, besides to dip them under water and take them up again in a solemn manner in five or six hours.

v. Then there is another obstacle to the immersion of the three thousand on the day of Pentecost—and in the time above specified. These people were baptized in their ordinary clothes—or they fetched a second suit for the occasion—or they were baptized naked. If they were dipped in the clothes they had about them while listening to Peter, they must have retired to their homes streaming with water, and as their garments were 'light and naturally loose,' their saturated state would have made them stick to the body of both the men and the women all the way to their lodgings. Or if they ran home directly after the sermon and fetched a second dress to be baptized in, they must have changed their apparel twice somewhere—our brethren suppose in the porches of the pool of Bethesda, where, as we have shown, sixteen persons must have been dressing and undressing in each at the same time—some pulling off their dry clothes and others their wet—and have been twice in a state of nudity before each other—and then the three thousand wet suits must have been bundled up and taken away to dry—or they must, in the last place, have been baptized naked, and if the pool of Bethesda were the place, all of them, men and women, before each other's eyes. One of these things, on the principle of our opponents, must have occurred. But as all of them are equally incredible, we conclude they were affused or sprinkled only.

[1] Booth, v. iii. p. 156.

VI. Let it be further remarked, that in all ceremonial purifications, of which baptism was certainly one, pure, fair, clean, running or living water was required—not water simply free from natural pollution, but void of all moral contagion. This is intimated by the apostle, 'and our bodies washed with *pure* water,' or, as Josephus expresses it, 'water drawn from perpetual springs,'[1] (HEB. x. 22.) It is also acknowledged by our opponents:—Dr. Gale says, 'a 'fountain or running stream in the remotest times was 'always judged *purest* and most proper for purification.'[2] Rees tells us, that 'the early Christians went to a river, 'brook, or pool of *fair* water, and there discharged a good 'conscience towards God.'[3] Also, that 'a single rivulet 'having pools of *fair* and deep water would have been as 'fit for John's baptism as if he had twenty.'[4] Therefore these three thousand must have been dipped into a running stream, and only one at a time, and the water must have been fair or pure; or each one of them must have been dipped into a separate tank or bath, and these vessels, if used repeatedly, must have been filled afresh for each candidate; since moral pollution was supposed to attach to the cleansing element.[5] This is plain from the baptisms under the law, to which reference has been made already. As the priest, by placing his hands on the head of the scape goat in the name of the congregation, transferred their guilt to the victim, so purifying the person with water transferred the moral pollution to the element. Now if there were no running streams of fair and pure water in or near Jerusalem, sufficiently large and deep for dipping the three thousand people; and if these were not at the command

[1] Ant. b. 3, c. 9, s. 1. [2] P. 113. [3] P. 178. [4] P. 126.
[5] Burder's Orien. Cust. No. 563; Gill, p. 213.

of the apostles, or some of the baptized, then at least eighteen thousand hogsheads of pure water must have been procured and consumed on the occasion. Whether this is probable, we shall proceed to examine.

VII. That there must have been a great difficulty in obtaining water in quality and quantity adapted for such an extraordinary immersion is evident from the best accredited evidence of different and impartial writers. We are informed, that pure or fair water, and such as people might drink, was exceedingly scarce and precious in Jerusalem and its vicinity—what the inhabitants procured for use being preserved with the utmost care in domestic reservoirs, made at a great expense and filled chiefly by the rains and snows which fell in the wet and Winter seasons.[1] (Compare 2 KINGS xviii. 31; PROV. v. 15; ECC. xii. 6; Is. xxxvi. 16; JER. ii. 13.) 'There was no fountain to form a brook 'in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem excepting that of Si-'loam—as St. Jerome expressly affirms in his commentary 'on Jeremiah the fourteenth; and which the accounts of 'travellers of later ages have confirmed. And as for the 'fountain of Siloam, which was near, sometimes it had no 'water, and sometimes when it had, was not agreeable to 'drink. The Crusaders in 1099, when besieging Jerusa-'lem, found the neighbourhood a very dry unwatered soil, 'having scarcely any brooks, fountains, or pits of fresh 'water. And as for those distant fountains to which the 'army were conducted, there was such pressing and hinder-'ing one another from drawing, that it was with difficulty 'and with long delays, that they got a little muddy water in 'their leathern bottles, of which a draught could not be pur-'chased but at an extravagant price.'[2] Mr. Robinson ad-

[1] Harmer's Obs. chap. 1. art. 21. [2] Ib. chap. 2, art. 52.

'mits, that 'in the time of Jerome, who lived there, [about 'A.D. 400] Jerusalem was ill supplied with water and sub-'ject to great droughts—and that it is now desolate,' he says, 'must be allowed.'[1]

Mr. Buckingham, who visited Jerusalem in January, 1816, says, 'at the southern extreme of this valley, we were 'shown a well bearing the name of the prophet Jeremiah, 'from a belief that the fire of the altar was recovered by 'him at this place after the Babylonish captivity, (Mac. i. '19.) It is narrow, but of considerable depth, and is sunk 'entirely out of a bed of rock. Being lower than any of 'the wells at Jerusalem, it retains a good supply of water 'while the others are dry. We found here a party of twelve 'or fifteen Arabs drawing water in leathern buckets, by 'cords and pulleys, and from twenty to thirty asses laden 'with skins of it for the city. The Pool of Siloam is now 'a dirty little brook, with scarcely any water in it; and 'even in the rainy seasons is said to be an insignificant 'and muddy stream.—In the rainy season, this narrow bed 'is filled with a torrent which is still called the Brook Ke-'dron, but it was, at the period of our visit, perfectly dry.'[2] '—The Brook Kedron,' says Mr. Brown, 'though it re-'ceives all the rivulets about Jerusalem, is generally but 'small and sometimes dry; but amidst sudden and heavy 'rains, it swells exceedingly, and runs with great violence, 'and on such occasions carries off the filth of the city, 'which by the common-sewers is carried into it.'[3]

It is further evident, that there was no natural spring or fountain of water in the city of Jerusalem itself; and as Jerom remarks, only one in the immediate neighbourhood, which arose in the valley of Siloam, and this did not al-

[1] Rob. p. 8. [2] Travels, p. 188 and 190. [3] Dict. in Loc.

ways run.[1] This water has several names, and was probably collected into different artificial reservoirs in its course down the valley. It is called the Pool of Siloam (John ix. 11, compare with Neh. iii. 15), which was divided into the upper and lower pools, (Is. vii. 3; xxii. 9.) Mr. Keach says it was the same as that designated Gihon,[2] (1 Kings i. 33, 88.) It is called the Dragon's Well, (Neh. ii. 13); and is said to go softly by Isaiah, (chap. viii. 6.) Dr. Clark says, this water 'rose under the wall of Jerusalem, 'towards the east, between the city and the Brook Kedron. 'Calmet thinks this is the same as Enrogel or the fullers' 'fountain, mentioned in Josh. xv. 7; xviii. 16.'[3] It is called Solomon's Pool, the Serpents' Pool, and the Pool of Struthius, by Josephus.[4]—Tacitus says, 'the Jews had a 'fountain of water that ran perpetually; and the moun-'tains were hollowed under ground. They had, moreover, 'pools and cisterns for the preservation of rain-water.'[5]— Now, a plain countryman, reading of all these waters, would imagine that there were as many fountains as pools; whereas, all these, as well as the Pool of Bethesda,[6] originated in one insignificant spring outside the walls of the city, or were in part reservoirs of rain water within. All the evidence obtainable on this subject fully corroborates our position. Josephus informs us, that when Antiochus besieged Jerusalem in the year 130 B.C. 'the Jews were 'once in want of water, which yet they were delivered 'from by a large shower of rain, which fell at the setting 'of the Pleiades;'[7] about February, the time of the latter rain.

[1] Calmet's Dict. art. Siloam. [2] Met. p. 121.
[3] In John ix. 7. [4] Hist. Wars, b. 5, c. 3, s. 2; c. 4, s. 2; c. 11, s. 4.
[5] Whiston's Jos. v. iv. p. 393. [6] Hist. Wars, b. 2, c. 15, s. 5.
[7] Ant. b. 13, c. 8, s. 2.

It is further confirmed by the same author, who tells us, that 'Pilate undertook to bring a current of water to 'Jerusalem, and did it with the sacred money, and derived 'the origin of the stream from the distance of two hundred 'furlongs. However the Jews were not pleased with what 'had been done [with the sacred money] about the water; 'and many ten thousands of the people got together, and 'made a clamour against him, and insisted that he should 'leave off that design.'[1] — Whether this was ever accomplished is uncertain—most probably not, as the work nor water is ever mentioned by the historian in his subsequent accounts of the city; but even if it had, it could not have been till long after the day of Pentecost, since it was not attempted till about the time of Tiberias' death, in the year 37, or at the earliest, not before the crucifixion of our blessed Lord. Our position is still further established by the speech Josephus made to the Jews, when Jerusalem was besieged by the Romans:—'And as for Titus, those 'springs that were formerly almost dried up when under 'your power, since he has come, run more plentifully than 'they did before: accordingly you know that Siloam, 'as well as all the other springs that were without the city, 'did so far fail, that water was sold by distinct measures; 'whereas they now have such a quantity of water for your 'enemies, as is sufficient not only for drink both for themselves and cattle, but for watering their gardens also. The 'same wonderful sign you had also experience of formerly, 'when the fore-mentioned king of Babylon made war 'against us, and when he took the city and burned 'the temple.'[2]

[1] Ant. b. 18, c. 3, s. 2, comp. with Hist. Wars, b. 2, c. 9. s. 4.
[2] Hist. Wars, b. 5, c. 9, s. 4.

The pools of water, made by Solomon to water his vineyards and gardens (Ec. ii. 6; Can. iv. 12), were at Ethan, a place six miles distant from Jerusalem;[1] nor have we any certainty as to the size of those which were supplied by the well or fountain of Siloam. The reservoirs shown to modern travellers, as the remains of the ancient structures, are unquestionably of an erection ulterior to the days of Pentecost.[2] Nor let it appear strange that a city should be built where there was, what we should designate, a paucity of water, as many other instances are mentioned of a similar nature in the same country. Jotapata, a large city of Galilee, had no well or fountain of water in it—the people generally using rain water.[3] Gamala, another considerable place, had only one spring in it, and this was inadequate to the wants of the inhabitants.[4] Masada, when besieged, was in want of water.[5] Josephus also mentions a city, Ostracine, where the inhabitants were obliged to fetch all the water they used from other parts.[6] Sychar depended chiefly on rain for water; and an army, collected on Mount Gerizzim, just by, was obliged to surrender, on account of their dreadful thirst.[7] Pitts says he paid a groat, or sixpence a gallon, for fresh water at Suez.[8] The uncommon aridity of many parts of the East, may be further illustrated by a reference to the Koran, in which Mahomet enjoins that sand be rubbed, poured, or sprinkled on his followers instead of water, when this latter element could not be obtained for their daily ablutions—a circumstance which he fully expected might frequently occur.[9]

[1] Ant. b. 8, c. 7, s. 3.
[2] Dr. A. Clarke, *supra*.
[3] Hist. Wars, b. 3, c. 7, s. 12.
[4] Ib. b. 4, c. 1, s. 1, 4, 8.
[5] Ant. b. 14, c. 14, s. 2.
[6] Hist. Wars, b. 4, c. 11, s. 5.
[7] Hist. Wars, b. 3, c. 7, s. 32.
[8] Calmet's Dict. Frag. No. 117.
[9] Rob. p. 56; Calmet's Dict. Frag. No. 103; Hurd's Rel. Cer. p. 326.

Thus much for the quantity of water obtainable for dipping the three thousand persons above referred to. Though we do not presume to say, in reference to recent observations, that waters, in the lapse of ages, may not change their course (see Ps. cvii. 33-35), yet in this case the narratives of modern researches are so analogous to what we find in the Holy Writings generally, and particularly to the conduct of Hezekiah, 'in stopping up the 'fountains and the brook that ran through the midst of 'the land, that the king of Assyria might not come and 'find much water' (2 Chron. xxxii. 4); that it was unquestionably the same on the day of Pentecost, as discovered by Mr. Buckingham in 1816. We have only to refer to a few passages of scripture, to perceive how different the East and Judea are situated, with respect to water, compared with us. Hence we find them—

In distresss, through want of water, (Ex. xv. 22; 1 Kings xvii. and xviii.; 2 Sam. xxiii. 15; Is. xli. 17; Jer. xiv. 1-6.)
Digging for water, (Gen. xxvi. 15, 19, 32; Deut. vi. 11; 2 Chron. xxvi. 10.)
Depriving of water, (2 Kings iii. 25; 2 Chron. xxxii. 4.)
Contending about water, (Gen. xxvi. 20; Judges v. 11; Neh. iv. 23.)
Valuing water, (1 Sam. xxv. 11; 2 K. xx. 20; Mat. x. 42.)
Paying for water, (Numb. xx. 17, 19; Lam. v. 4.)

Nor is our argument affected by those frequent expressions of much water, many waters, great waters, waters in the plural number, and the like; since they are certainly hyperbolical, and can be interpreted only as referring to a comparative portion of this element in an arid climate,

where it is confessedly very scarce and precious. The like must be said respecting the language of Moses, in DEUT. viii. 7, where he tells the Hebrews that God would bring them 'into a good land, a land of brooks of water, 'of fountains and depths, that spring out of valleys and 'hills.' This description must be understood in reference to 'the great and terrible wilderness wherein was drought, 'and where there was no water,' mentioned in the fifteenth verse of the same chapter, and not in reference to the well-watered plains and valleys of this island. At all events, the terms will not apply in any great extent to Jerusalem and its immediate neighbourhood. The expression is highly figurative; nor have we any right, with so many topographical illustrations before us, to understand it literally any more than to suppose that the Holy Land was actually '*flowing with milk and honey*'—a description applied to it about a dozen times in the writings of Moses.

VIII. From the combination of circumstances now mentioned, we assume that the three thousand were not dipped at all. When we find that the words of the institution do not necessarily require dipping, and equally favour aspersion—when so many difficulties oppose the notion of immersion in the case now before us—when fair or pure water was so scarce, and the preservation of it so essential to the existence of the inhabitants—when there was no river or running stream of pure water in the vicinity of Jerusalem suited to such an immersion—and when, on the lowest calculation, eighteen thousand hogsheads of this water of life was necessary for dipping the people on this memorable afternoon—when this must have been obtained of enemies for strangers, become detestable by changing their religion—and when the difficulty of being dipped

decently and conveniently are added to these obstacles, we infer that their immersion was almost the last thing one could believe respecting them. We therefore conclude that they were not plunged into or under water, but that a small portion was poured or sprinkled upon them. This places the case within the limits of prescription and beyond the influence of the smallest difficulty.

III. The numerous Baptisms subsequently Administered.—The baptism of the three thousand mentioned before, was not all the apostles had to perform.

1. The sermon which Peter preached on a following day in Solomon's porch was still more successful—five thousand persons having believed his doctrine and conformed to his maxims (Acts iv. 4); and if the apostles did not depart from their usual method, of which we have no intimation— if 'baptism was administered immediately 'on conviction of the truth of the report,'—then they all immediately underwent this operation. But as Peter and John appear to have been the only apostles engaged on this memorable occasion, and our opponents cannot prove there were more, better than we can prove children were baptized, their task, according to the notions of our Baptist brethren, must have been overwhelming; and, agreeably to the time at present consumed in plunging adults, must have laboriously occupied these ministers, and kept them from preaching the gospel for the salvation of others, to accomplish which they were especially appointed (1 Cor. i. 17), more than a fortnight. There were then all the difficulties of doing it decently—of procuring water—of personally examining them—and the like, as noticed before; and which, after what has been already advanced, must have been enormous and overwhelming. We conclude, there-

fore, that these five thousand were baptized only by pouring or aspersion—then all obstacles vanish.

II. In the following chapter (Acts v. 14), we learn that 'believers were the more added to the church, multi-'tudes both men and women.' We have no definite enumeration of the numbers; but we may reasonably conclude, from the general use of the expressions in the New Testament, that they were at least many thousands. Now, it is said of these that they were added to the church, and, from analogy, we may conclude that they were all previously baptized—'baptism in scripture always preceded adding 'to a visible church.' Consequently, on the hypothesis of our brethren, all these multitudes, men and women, were immersed publicly in Jerusalem under all the disadvantages and difficulties mentioned above. What labour—what work—what water required—what scenes—what excitement among the ungodly! In fact, from the myriads early added to the church in the apostolic age (Acts ix. 35; xi. 21, 24; xxi. 20, *Greek*, for thousands, read myriads), and soon after, when most of the Roman empire was nominally converted to Christianity,[1] the work of dipping such immense masses of people must have been sufficient to have occupied all the time and strength of the apostles and their successors, without any other avocation. Let those believe it that can. To us it appears incredible, and not being enjoined, is deemed impracticable. We therefore conclude that the early Christians were all baptized by affusion or aspersion only. This would have preserved decency in the sacrament, and have made its administration every way feasible and significant.

IV. In opposition to all this evidence, and in order to

[1] See Whiston's Josephus, v. iv. p. 397.

remove every obstacle to the immersion of the three thousand on the day of Pentecost, Mr. Booth says, 'People, 'who are but little accustomed to bathing, either for 'amusement, for medicinal purposes, or with religious 'views, may wonder how such multitudes could be accom-'modated, if they were immersed in water; but when it is 'considered that this was done at Jerusalem, where immer-'sion was quite familiar, and must, by the laws of Judaism, 'be daily practised, not only there, but in all parts of the 'country, their amazement will cease.'[1] — In reply to this statement we remark,—

I. That it is mere assumption to say, that immersion was familiar and practised daily at Jerusalem. It is probable the people purified themselves every day, and did what Moses enjoined in the wilderness, or that they purified each other. That bathing, or dipping the whole body in water was not enjoined by the Jewish legislator, we have rendered evident already. Nor have we any evidence that the tradition of the elders enforced such a mode of lustration.

II. That some of the Jews had baths for amusement and medicinal purposes, we have no question. Herod the Great erected many—some at a vast expense—and even on the tops of high towers, supplying them with rain water.[2] Nor is it a matter of the least moment how often the people bathed themselves for their pleasure or their health—as that is not the question at issue, though ingeniously blended with it.

III. That the people and all of them bathed themselves by immersion every day, 'with religious views,' is what we very much doubt—though had this been the fact, it is no

[1] Vol. I. p. 250. [2] Jos. Hist. Wars, b. 5, c. 4, s. 3.

warrant for one person's dipping another—which is allowed by all our opponents, who have noticed this operation, to have been a perfect novelty, or till the time of John, never performed; and after what has been said respecting the locality of the city, must have been impracticable.

IV. That water was very precious in Jerusalem, especially pure, running, or living water, which was requisite for a ceremonial ablution, we have amply demonstrated. Now, the regular inhabitants of Jerusalem, which was about forty furlongs in circumference,[1] and densely crowded with houses and people, besides multitudes living in the immediate neighbourhood, must have been immense; but of these we have no definite account. We learn, however, that at the festivals there were vast numbers, who came from all parts to be purified (2 CHRON. xxx. 18; JOHN xi. 55; ACTS xxi. 24, 26); or, according to Mr. Booth, to be immersed daily while they remained there, which was often a week or fortnight. There were three millions present at the Passover in the year 65 A.D.; and a little later, on a similar festival, two hundred and fifty-six thousand five hundred paschal lambs were sacrificed; and allowing twelve persons to each lamb, which is no immoderate calculation three million and seventy-eight thousand must have been assembled.[2] Now, all these must have immersed themselves daily, and, if they were accidentally polluted oftener, they as often must have been dipped under water! And really, if this had been done, there would have been little amazement at the bathing of the three thousand, though the people might have felt surprized at the novelty of seeing what they had never seen before—one man dipping another.

[1] Josephus' Hist. Wars, b. 5, c. 12, s. 2.
[2] Ib. b. 2, c. 14, s. 3, and Whiston's note.

But as no person will credit the assumption of Mr. Booth, when thus investigated, we shall recur to our former inference, that the three thousand were not plunged into or under water, but that a small portion was poured or sprinkled upon them. This removes all amazement, places the case within the limits of prescription, and beyond the influence of the smallest difficulty.

SECTION SIXTH.

THE BAPTISM OF THE HOLY GHOST.

A brief review of this important subject will fully establish the doctrine we have been labouring to prove. It will show the sacramental sense of the word baptize—and demonstrate the manner in which water-baptism was administered in the first age of the Christian church, and, on the principles of our brethren, how it should be performed in the present day. This topic is so lucid in its nature, and the deductions arising from it are so simple and conclusive in our favour, that we need not be very elaborate in the discussion to substantiate in the firmest manner that Christian baptism consists in pouring, sprinkling, or applying the water to the person. Indeed, if there were no other evidence obtainable in support of our practice, this would be ample, and, to every unprejudiced, intelligent mind, convincing. We shall proceed, therefore, to make a few observations for the purpose of illustrating this interesting point. We remark—

I. That the baptisms of the Holy Ghost and of water are mentioned in such connexions and under such circum-

stances as to lead every unbiassed mind to conclude that both were administered in the same manner—our opponents, indeed, admit this position.[1] But some of them seem disposed to assume that we are dipped into the Holy Ghost, and, consequently, that we sould be dipped into water. Our ensuing remarks will invalidate the former assumption and induce an inference which must overturn the latter. Let us hear the analogous representations of the baptism of the Spirit and of water:—

Matt. iii. 11. 'I baptize you with water; he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire.'

Mark i. 8. 'I have baptized you with water, but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost.'

Luke iii. 16. 'I baptize you with water, but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire.'

John i. 33. 'He that sent me to baptize with water, the same is he that baptizeth with the Holy Ghost.'

Acts i. 5. 'John truly baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost.'

ii. 8. 'The Holy Ghost had fallen upon none of them, only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.'

ii. 38. 'Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.'

x. 37, 38. 'And began from Galilee, after the baptism which John preached, how God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power.'

x. 47. 'Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?'

xi. 15. 'The Holy Ghost fell on them; then remembered I the word of the Lord: John indeed baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost.'

Here you perceive that the baptisms of the Spirit and of water are associated in the evangelical narratives in such a way as constrain us to conclude that the mode of communication was the same in both cases. In fact, there would be

[1] Maclean, v. iii. p. 189.

a perversion of all consistent language if there existed any very material difference between them. To suppose that in the above verses the word baptize is employed for two such different actions as immersing and pouring, without any intimation to that effect, would be charging men who wrote as they were moved by the Holy Ghost and in words divinely inspired (1 Cor. ii. 13), with an incongruity of composition too egregious for the meanest scribler in Christendom. We, therefore, infer that the baptisms of the Spirit and of water were administered in the same manner. Now the only question for our consideration is by what mode of application were men baptized by the Spirit? Or, in other words, were they applied to the Spirit in the form of dipping, or was the Spirit applied to them in the shape of pouring or sprinkling? For it happens in this case that the manner was ostensible, and the expressions are as lucid as the light.

II. To give the subject a fair consideration, we shall refer you, in the first place, to the *promises* of the Old Testament, in which we shall discover that the manner of the Spirit's application to the people was to be by pouring or sprinkling only. A few citations here will suffice.

Isaiah xxxii. 15. 'Until the Spirit be poured upon us from on high.'

xliv. 3. 'I will pour water upon him that is thirsty and floods upon the dry ground; I will pour my Spirit upon thy seed and my blessing upon thine offspring.'

lii. 15. 'So shall he sprinkle many nations.'

Ezek. xxxix. 29. 'I have poured out my Spirit upon the house of Israel.'

Joel ii. 28, 29. 'I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh, and your sons and your daughters shall prophecy; and upon the servants and upon the handmaids in those days will I pour out of my Spirit.'

Zech. xii. 10. 'And I will pour upon the house of David and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem the Spirit of grace and of supplication.'

These passages render it plain that the promises of the Old Testament represent the Holy Spirit as being poured or sprinkled on the people, especially under the gospel economy. No instance can be found where it is said they shall be dipped, or even, as it were, dipped into the Holy Ghost. The promises which were announced by John, in MATT. iii. 11, and by Christ, in ACTS i. 5, assure us that the Spirit was to come upon the people under the Christian dispensation.[1] The same ideas are suggested in various other parts of the sacred writings.

III. We shall, secondly, refer you to the *declarations* of the Old Testament respecting the mode of application of the Holy Spirit—and the representation is universally in our favour. He—

I. *Came upon Balaam* (NUMB. xiv. 10), *Jephthah* (JUDGES xi. 20), *Othniel* (Ib. iii. 10), *Gideon* (Ib. vi. 34), *Samson* (Ib. xiv. 6, 19), *Saul* (1 SAM. xvi. 13), *his messengers* (Ib. xix. 20), *David* (Ib. xvi. 13), *&c.*

II. *Poured out upon*, EZEK. xxxix. 29; PROV. i. 23.

III. *Put upon them*, NUMB. xi. 17, 29; Is. xlii. 1.

IV. *Put within them*, Ez. xi. 19; xxxvi. 27; xxxvii. 14.

V. *Given to them*, NEH. ix. 20.

VI. *Resting upon them*, NUMB. xi. 26; 2 KINGS ii. 15.

VII. *Filled with him*, EXOD. xxxi. 2.

From this reference you will perceive that under the Old Testament economy the spirit of God is represented invariably as coming to, into, and upon the people—while the people are never said to come to, or be dipped into the Spirit.[2] Those passages in which the working or operations of the Spirit are noticed, do, in no degree, interfere with our

[1] See Jenkins' C. R. p. 22; Keach, p. 4.
[2] See Owen on the Spirit, c. 5.

position, since the mode of his communication is the only thing we are now investigating. He is said to lead, teach, enlighten, quicken, sanctify, comfort, and the like; but our object is only to consider how he comes into union with mankind, as the action only of baptizing now solicits a development.

IV. Having shown how the Holy Spirit was applied to the people under the legal dispensation, and the terms employed to express his future communication under the gospel economy, we shall proceed to examine the mode of his coming, as detailed by the evangelists and apostles.

i. *Abiding upon them*, John i. 32.
ii. *Anointing them*, Acts x. 38.
iii. *Breathed on them*, John xx. 22.
iv. *Coming upon them*, Acts i. 8; ix. 6.
v. *Descending on them*, John i. 32.
vi. *Falling on them*, Acts viii. 16; x. 44.
vii. *Filling them*, Acts ii. 4; ix. 17.
viii. *Given to them*, Luke xi. 13; John iii. 34.
ix. *Ministered to them*, Gal. iii. 5.
x. *Poured upon them*, Acts i. 17; x. 45.
xi. *Received of the Father*, John vii. 39; Acts viii. 15.
xii. *Resting on them*, 1 Pet. iv. 14.
xiii. *Sealing them*, Eph. i. 13.
xiv. *Sent from on high*, Luke xxiv. 49; 1 Pet. i. 9.
xv. *Shed on them*, Acts i. 33; Titus iii. 6.
xvi. *Sitting upon them*, Acts ii. 3.

In this list of expressions you will easily discover in what manner the Holy Ghost was given to the people—always by coming to, into, or upon them—but they are never said to be dipped into the Holy Spirit. And if you refer to some of the phraseology commonly employed by our oppo-

nents in reference to the action of baptism and apply it to the case before us—it must make absolute nonsense if not something much worse:—bathed in the Holy Spirit—buried in the Holy Spirit—descending into the Holy Spirit—dipping into the Holy Spirit—entombing, immersing, and interring in the Holy Spirit—planting and plunging in the Holy Spirit—and if to this you add the corresponding expressions, raising, rising, and ascending out of the Holy Spirit, the language becomes quite insufferable.

V. Here it may be right to show you that however our opponents may debate, as to the mode of baptism by water, they give up the point in most cases respecting the mode of baptizing by the Spirit. Their observations are worthy of your attention. *Dr. Jenkins* says, 'baptism may fairly express the state of the disciples when overwhelmed with 'the Spirit, though he *fell upon* them.'[1]—*Booth* says, 'a 'person may, indeed, be surrounded with subtle effluvia, a 'liquid may be so *poured*, or it may so distil upon him, 'that he may be as if immersed'[2] [or baptized.]—*Cox* says, 'a person may be, indeed, immersed [that is baptized] 'by means of pouring.'[3]—*Keach*, 'though the baptism of 'the Spirit was by pouring forth of the Spirit, yet they were 'overwhelmed or immersed in it.'[4]—'If you pour water 'on a child until it is covered all over in water, it may be 'truly said that child was buried [or baptized] in water.'[5] From these citations, out of many more, we gather that the word baptize is here used for pouring, since the baptism of the Spirit came upon the people, or fell upon them from above. Their quibble as to the quantity, we have noticed before and shall presently refer to it again. To talk of the

[1] Jenkins's C. R. p. 22. [2] Vol. i. p. 97. [3] P. 94. [4] P. 4. [5] P. 26.

condition being baptism is only an evasion, since the action by which that condition is induced, is the only point in debate, as our opponents have repeatedly told us, and as a fair consideration of the case renders unquestionable.

VI. Let it be further observed, that as the sprinkling or pouring of water on the ceremonially unclean, is said to sanctify (Heb. ix. 13), purge (Ps. li. 7; Heb. ix. 21, 22), cleanse (Ezek. xxxvi. 25), and wash them (Heb. x. 22); so the Holy Spirit, being poured out or sprinkled on the morally polluted, is said to renew (Titus iii. 5), cleanse (Ezek. xxxvi. 25), wash (1 Cor. vi. 11), and sanctify them, (1 Cor. vi. 11.) Hence we have not only an analogy between the modes of communicating the Spirit and water in baptism, but also between the effects produced by that communication. The one being the thing signified and the other the sign of it. This corroborates the position we have assumed, that the out-pouring of the Holy Spirit and the application of water to the object in the shape of pouring or sprinkling were designed to be like each other.

VII. It may be noticed, also, that the baptism of the Spirit is called the anointing of the Spirit. 'That word, ye 'know, which was published throughout all Judea, and 'began from Galilee after the baptism which John preached, 'how God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost 'and with power,' (Acts x. 37, 38.) Passing over the analogy between John's baptism and the anointing of Christ by the Holy Spirit; we remark that all anointings were administered by pouring precious oil on the heads of persons consecrated to office, and who are said to have been qualified for it by the reception of the Holy Spirit[1]—whether kings (1 Sam. xv. 1), or priests (Ex. xxix. 7), or prophets,

[1] Owen on the Spirit, c. 5.

(1 Kings xix. 16.) Now the Jews were a kingdom of priests and a holy nation (Ex. xix. 6), and as such were anointed or consecrated to God (Lam. iv. 20); and the saints under the gospel dispensation being kings and priests unto God and the Lamb (Rev. i. 6), are consecrated in the same manner. Hence they have an unction (or anointing) from the Holy One, (1 John ii. 20, compare v. 27.[1]) But as water is employed to symbolize the Spirit, so it should be applied to represent the manner of the Spirit's anointing. Hence we arrive at a conclusion similar to the preceding, that the baptism of the Spirit, here called anointing, was effected by pouring out the Spirit, and that the baptism of water, which is an emblem of anointing, should be by pouring also. For, as before remarked, water being a cheaper article than precious oil, we can easily perceive why the element was occasionally varied; and, as sprinkling was a more expeditious method than pouring, there is no difficulty in ascertaining why the mode was altered, though the design of consecration remained the same. In fact, whatever be the design of the Holy Spirit—whether to purify, anoint, or instruct—the manner of his communication is the same—pouring, sprinkling, or coming to or upon the object; and therefore, whether we regard water-baptism as a figurative purification, anointing, or mode of instruction, the action of applying it remains the same—pouring, sprinkling, or coming to, or upon the people.

VIII. The only material response of our opponents to this reasoning, is an application to Acts ii. 2:—'And sud-'denly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing 'mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were 'sitting'—in which they would fain discover something like

[1] See Keach's Met. p. 188.

a dipping into the Holy Ghost. They tell us the disciples were surrounded by the Holy Ghost,[1] or, as it were, drowned or immersed in it.[2] 'The apostles were as com-'pletely immersed in the Holy Spirit, as the body is im-'mersed in water at baptism.'[3] — But there are two or three circumstances which completely destroy their hypothesis on the passage.

I. This was not the Holy Ghost, nor even the wind, that filled the house, but a sound, a great noise, resembling the rushing of the wind. This might be said to fill the house, indeed, as the preacher's voice fills the chapel; but if our friends can find a scriptural precept or apostolical example for denominating the Holy Spirit a great noise, or can suppose a house crammed with sound, as a vessel is filled even with air, either quiescent or in motion, we shall give them credit for erudite researches and refined imaginations. This sound, however, was not the Holy Spirit. He descended and sat upon the heads of the apostles in the likness of cloven tongues of fire, which were 'a symbol of its exter-'nal manifestation.'[4]

II. But there is a second reply still more fatal to their objection. Supposing them correct as to the element, which we have seen they are not, it evidently came from above, and descended upon them, filling the room where the disciples had previously assembled. It came from heaven. They were not plunged into it, for it fell upon them. As the whole question at issue turns on the action or mode of baptism, the quantity of the element can have nothing to do with solving it. Nor, indeed, would they so often

[1] Booth, vol. i. p. 97. [2] Keach's Met. p. 184; Maclean, v. iii. p. 190.
[3] Gibbs, p. 40.
[4] Keach's Met. p. 184; and Jenkins' Def. p. 127.

recur to the quantity or condition, were they not perplexed about the mode of its communication.

III. The disciples, moreover, were to be baptized with the Holy Ghost as they were with fire, which was 'a sym-'bol of its external manifestation,' (MATT. iii. 11; LUKE iii. 16.) Now, what was the action here? Were they immersed, plunged, or dipped into the fire? No.—'And 'there appeared unto them cloven tongues as of fire,' (like a bishop's mitre,) 'and it sat upon each of them,' (ACTS ii. 3.) The promise refers alike to both elements, the Spirit and fire, and the application of both are equally called baptism. Hence, if they were dipped into the Holy Ghost, they were also dipped into the fire. But the fire came and sat upon them—consequently, the Holy Ghost descended upon them in like manner. This we must conclude, or imagine the Baptist speaking more inconsistently than the most blundering Pedobaptist in the country.

IX. From this concise view of the baptism of the Holy Ghost, the following deductions appear legitimate:—

I. That the out-pouring of the Holy Ghost is really and truly baptism. It is repeatedly called baptism, and presented a visible and indubitable exhibition to the eyes of the spectator. When our opponents call this a mere metaphorical baptism, they employ a misnomer, which proves that the subject is somewhat embarrassing to them, and that there is no method of extricating themselves, but by resolving the terms into a figure of speech. Their wisest authors, however, have occasionally conceded this point in an honest manner.

II. That the baptism of the Holy Spirit and of water are so conjoined and blended in the predictions, promises, narratives, and declarations of the Old and New Testa-

ments, as to induce the inference, that both were administered in the same way. Indeed, it would betray a confusion of language, equal to that at Babel, were the baptism of the Spirit to be pouring on the people, and that of water plunging them into it.

III. That as the leading terms employed to designate this institution, are equally favourable to pouring or sprinkling as to dipping or immersing—as there is no instance found in the Bible where the word baptize is used for one person plunging another; nor any where in the Greek language, for the two-fold action of putting under water and raising again—as the circumstances of the early scripture and Christian baptisms demonstrate that pouring or sprinkling was the universal and invariable method—and as the baptism of the Holy Spirit is represented as being always effected in this manner, we come unhesitatingly to the conclusion, that dipping is not Christian baptism, and that affusion or aspersion is; and therefore, 'if what is not com-'manded by Christ or practised by his apostles, be virtually 'forbidden as will-worship'[1]—if it be 'clear that nothing 'can be baptism, which varies from Christ's institution'[2]—then, on their own principles, the Baptists are all, what they designate us, an unbaptized body of people.

SECTION SEVENTH.

THE NUMEROUS DIFFICULTIES ATTENDING IMMERSION.

We have no hesitation in saying that such are the difficulties attending the system of our opponents—that it is not

[1] Dore's Introd. p. 19. [2] Gale, p. 66.

likely our blessed Lord should have enjoined it without an imperious necessity—and that we should not adopt it without the clearest evidence. We have, however, shown you that it was never instituted by Christ, that it was never practised by his immediate followers, and that it is an invention of men who have endeavoured to improve the appointments of the gospel. Our design is now to show you that the scheme we are combatting ought to be immediately abandoned, not only as unscriptural, but also as presenting obstacles to its performance, which at once determine the line of conduct we ought to pursue. We are conducted to this view of the controversy by the repeated declarations of our brethren respecting the universal practicability of their mode, the pleasure of submitting to it, and the great significance and solemnity of its administration—at the same time treating 'pouring or sprinkling a few drops of water upon an un-'conscious baby out of a bason or porringer,' as they express themselves, with ridicule and contempt—as being unscriptural and childish, and 'a profanation of the ordinance 'of baptism.' Let us examine whether their scheme be really what they pronounce it, and whether pouring or sprinkling is not more like a New Testament sacrament, better calculated to preserve every delicacy of Christian worship, and to become universal with the extending empire of the Son of God, than that of submersion.

I. Admitting that the original institution had been to dip the people in baptism, but which we have shown was by no means the case, if the practice were found in any age, country, or condition, to militate against health and decency, it might be changed for some other mode, which, while preserving the spirit of the rite, removed the difficulties of

a particular administration. Thus our opponents have repeatedly varied or entirely omitted several positive institutions of the New Testament. It is a principle of Christianity that, when moral obligations, the reasons of which fully appear, besides being divinely enjoined, conflict with mere positive laws, the reasons of which do not appear, or but very indistinctly, though also divinely enjoined, the latter are always to give place to the former. For example: it was a positive institution of God, that the priests alone should eat the shew-bread of the sanctuary. Yet when David, and the men adhering to his interest, went to Nob, Abimelech gave this very bread to them to allay their hunger—that is, he broke a positive law to perform an act of mercy; and our Lord sanctioned the act, and commended the principle, by adding, 'I will have mercy and not [or, rather than] sacrifice,' (Lev. xxiv. 6-9; 1 Sam. xxi. 3-6; Matt. xii. 3.) It was a positive institution of the Almighty, that no work was to be done on the Sabbath day. 'Every one that defileth it, shall surely be put to death; 'for whoso doeth any work thereon, that soul shall be cut 'off from among his people.' But moral obligations, when operating against this enactment, are to have the entire preponderance. 'The priests profane the temple [by labour-'ing] on the Sabbath day, and are blameless. What man 'shall there be among you, that shall have one sheep, if it 'fall into a pit on the Sabbath day, will he not lay hold on 'it, and [labour till he] lift it out?' (Ex. xx. 10; xxxi. 14; Matt. xii. 5, 11.) Now, to preserve female modesty—our health and our lives—are moral obligations—the reasons for which we clearly perceive, besides being commanded by God himself. But were immersion-baptism clearly a positive institution of Christ—the reasons of which our

opponents do not even pretend to see—if it should appear that in any case or country, such a mode militates against these moral obligations—our sole Director in such matters has told us plainly how to interpret his will, and has assured us, that mere positive enactments, under those circumstances, are to yield to moral obligations; and though there might be cases in which the illiterate 'ploughman' would feel somewhat perplexed in determining between what is merely positive and what is moral-positive, and wherein the advice of a Baptist pastor might be requisite to direct his conduct—yet the principle of interpretation our Lord has given, will be found correct and universally available, perfectly harmonizing with the present subject of controversy. It is also admitted by our opponents.—Mr. Booth says, 'when positive appointments and moral 'duties cannot be both performed—when the one or the 'other must be omitted—the preference is given to the mo-'ral and spiritual duty.'[1] — But this observation is made by the bye, and, with our view of the original institution, is not of immediate application. We shall, therefore, proceed to notice some of the difficulties of immersion-baptism, as a reason for supposing, after what has been adduced, that Christ would not have instituted such a rite in his church, and to show that it ought to be resisted by Christians with all their might.

II. The natural dread which most people have of being plunged under water by another person, presents a powerful difficulty in the way of immersion baptism; a dread which health, nerves, and piety, in nine cases out of ten, fail to dissipate. And while this assertion holds true, with respect to most of the male sex, it applies with peculiar force

[1] Vol. I. p. 14.

to the more timid and delicate sisterhood—who are by far the majority that submit to it. Nor do we wonder at their hesitation. For a female, modest and fearful, who, perhaps, was never under water, and scarcely ever up to the knee in it before, to be led into a baptistry or river—then to be taken hold of by a man in whose strength and skill she may have no great confidence, and to be plunged backward under water, without the least possibility of helping herself in case of accidents, which she knows have sometimes occurred, and consequently may still happen, must be a most formidable operation, especially to such as are timid and bashful, and when the crowd around is large and unconverted. Perhaps in all the lifetime of most Baptist ladies, nothing ever occurs so trying to their modesty or so appalling to their minds, as this dipping; for though their bodies are not truly overwhelmed with water, their spirits are with perturbation; nor is this an imaginary difficulty. Their confessions will attest its reality, and if these were withheld, how ample is the concomitant evidence? How often have we seen pious and excellent women, with courage sufficient for the most arduous duties of Christianity, even for missionary enterprize among the most savage tribes of mankind, when at the font, instead of being in a composed and devotional frame of mind, fix their eyes on the water as if it would certainly cause their death? How long are many of them ere they can bring their mind to submit to this ordinance? How many exhortations are employed in the name of God and applied to their sense of duty, their gratitude, and their fears, to induce many women to submit? How often are they told that unless they are dipped they will not fulfill all righteousness, nor prove their love to Christ, nor, in fact, be entitled to the Christian name? Our opponents even go farther than this

on some occasions, and give broad and significant hints that this plunging is indispensable to salvation? How often have females fainted in the arms of the minister, and been brought to their senses only by the shock of the plunging; as was the case not long ago at Bristol? How often are they heard to scream in the baptistry? And sometimes they have been dragged out of the water, apparently lifeless, as was the case with a person very recently in London. How many are Baptists in sentiment, and therefore Baptists in reality, who have never been able to muster sufficient courage to undergo this ceremony? How many baptisms are performed in places with closed doors, contrary to their avowed principles of always doing it in public? And how many travel miles from home to be immersed, where they are little known, because they are ashamed to be dipped in the sight of their neighbours? An opponent justly remarks, 'There is some *inconvenience*, 'and there is not a little odium connected with believers' 'baptism [by immersion]; at least, under certain circum-'stances. Many persons may be met with, who profess 'themselves *convinced* on the subject, but who cannot en-'counter the opposition presented to their imagination, or 'overcome their own *reluctance*, so as to submit to what 'they believe to be a divine command.'[1] — A Baptist minister, while recently dining with the preacher, told him that 'a married lady of his neighbourhood and of his con-'gregation, went six or seven miles from home to be bap-'tized. When she came to the place—the water ready and 'people waiting—her courage failed, and she for a consi-'derable time would not submit. Entreaties and arguments 'were copiously administered, but for awhile ineffectually:

[1] Lect. on Bapt. by Evans, &c. p. 125.

'then she was ready and then she was terrified at the pro-'spect, and made herself quite ridiculous—and was at last 'got into and under the water almost by main force.'— We ask you, whether such a rite was likely to have been instituted by Christ, and whether, when un-instituted, it should not be strenuously opposed?

III. The above may be considered as remarks of a general character. There are circumstances where the difficulties are greatly increased. In the case of people converted in old age, unless of very vigorous constitutions, the obstacles must be immense; for if they must be baptized subsequent to regeneration,[1] and if it must be done by plunging the poor old creatures absolutely under water—in nine cases out of ten the rite must be foregone; and these truly regenerated people, according to the constitution of most Baptist churches, must be deprived of the sacrament of the Lord's supper, and from being members of their societies. Persons, also, indisposed must, in general, omit a reception of this rite. Such as are afflicted with rheumatic pains, or subject to the ague, or very liable to chills or colds, or to pulmonary diseases, or to the gout, sore throats, affections of the glands, spasmodic, and other internal complaints, epilepsy, erysipelas, apoplexy, or determination of blood to the head, and similar diseases, which are certainly not uncommon, must, without almost a miracle, suffer materially, if not fatally, from such an operation. All this is indirectly admitted by our respected opponents. Dr. Jenkins says, 'a man may believe and not have the means or '*capacity* of baptism. There are cases in which immersion 'would be dangerous, and it is better to defer the adminis-'tration and not to run the hazard of instant death.'[2] Dr.

[1] Gibbs, p. 342. [2] Def. p. 14, 63.

Gale intimates the same idea, when he says, 'the desire of 'baptism is sufficient when baptism itself cannot be had.'[1] That is, the sacrament in question is to be nullified, when obstacles to its performance arise. These are very frequent among our brethren, but such were never known to prevent baptism as administered by the apostles under the most unfavourable circumstances for dipping, and never prevent its performance by Pedobaptists in this country. Their notion of neglecting baptism altogether is opposed to the declaration of our Lord, who makes this sacred application of water obligatory on all, (MATT. xxviii. 19; JOHN iii. 5.[2]) Here then are insuperable difficulties in the way of administering this rite according to the mode of our opponents; but all of which vanish according to our's. The assumption, therefore, is, that we are right and that they are wrong.

IV. There are difficulties arising from what we hesitate not to pronounce the indelicacy of this ordinance, as administered by our opponents—at least, in the estimation of multitudes that witness its performance. We maintain that this is a good presumptive evidence against immersion, and as such only shall we adduce it. Our brethren fail not to say all in their power to oppose aspersion, and we are bound to advance all we can in opposition to dipping.

1. We say then that this rite, in respect of females removed above the lower classes of society, must be deemed a very great cross; nor can it be always administered in a way not to produce many misgivings in the minds of its most partial adherents. The following fact, among thousands more, will establish our assertion:—A gentleman was about to be dipped, and to join a Baptist communion;

[1] P. 76. [2] See Maclean, v. 1. p. 130.

but before undergoing the operation himself, he went to witness the immersion of two or three women. The sight and the scenes disgusted him. He thought the Saviour could not have enjoined such an indecent rite. He returned —examined the scriptures—altered his mind—and relinquished the honour of being dipped. He is now a respectable minister of the Independent denomination. That our opponents themselves are not very positive on this head, may be inferred from the following remark of Mr. Booth: —'So then,' says he, 'the voice of national decency is to 'be heard, and the force of local custom is to be felt, in the 'administration of a divinely positive rite, even though the 'will of the Institutor be the sole ground of the institution.'[1] What is implied you may easily perceive. Nor let it be forgotten that our brethren do consider national decency and the force of local customs, in respect of other institutions, as much divinely instituted as dipping. That there often is an indecency in the operation, few who have witnessed it will deny. Accidents and exposures have occurred to the utter confusion of all the interested parties.— A female was recently immersed in a river in Gloucestershire; and, for want of the leads and dresses used by John the Baptist and the apostles, an accident occurred, which caused the crowd of spectators on the opposite bank to shout and vociferate in a most deafening manner. Nor is this a solitary instance of similar evils. And what do our opponents mean, by calling their baptism 'taking up the cross,' if something of the above description were not possible? We would further ask the respectable benedicts of the Baptist denomination whether they would suffer their wives and their daughters to be bathed at our watering-

[1] Booth, v. iii. p. 118, 119.

places by men instead of women, though the indelicacy would be by no means greater than here, and their muscular powers would be often advantageous? Would they not blush at the very idea?

11. It is also clear, that if immersion-baptism had been the practice in the days of Christ and of his inspired apostles, and intended by them to have been so administered to the end of time; and if it be liable to abuse, as we have shown and shall further establish, that some grave cautions, respecting its performance, would have been given in the New Testament. That this rite is obnoxious to numerous difficulties in our day, with all the help of modern contrivance, cannot be denied. And we may fairly conclude, that when dipping one another was confessedly a new thing in the earth—when nearly a whole nation was baptized, probably twice over, in a short time—and when such facilities as our opponents enjoy were unknown and unavailable—numerous difficulties of various kinds must have arisen; and, having occurred, would be still naturally anticipated. And yet it is remarkable, that neither Christ nor his disciples, in their discourses or writings, ever intimate the existence of such accidents, or guard against them for the future. If it had been intended that all converts should be immersed, and conscious of a liability in the mode to indecorum and the injury of the health, would not the Saviour or his followers have said something about doing it decently and in order, that the health might not be injured, nor modesty outraged by carelessness or precipitation? And is not this inference corroborated by the injunctions of the apostle respecting the proper administration of the Lord's Supper (1 Cor. xi. 17-34), and the order of divine worship? (Ib. 1-16.) The very circumstance of there

being no cautions, where so much needed, induces us to conclude, that immersion was not practised in the apostolic age, nor intended to be performed afterwards.

III. It however is frequently insinuated that what we designate modesty, was not in such high estimation among the Jews in former times, and consequently that our reasonings will not apply to New Testament baptisms. This reply, however, is founded on a gross mistake. The greatest delicacy, especially in respect of women, was considered a virtue of no ordinary lustre. Look at the curse of Noah denounced against Canaan, for not covering his father's nakedness, and his blessing implored on Shem and Japhet for doing it, (GEN. ix. 20-25.) Look at the construction of the altar, and the extra garments made for the priests in offering sacrifices, that their persons might not be in the least degree exposed, (Ex. xx. 26; xxviii. 42.) Look at the threatening of God against the Chaldeans for their crimes, that their nakedness should be exposed, (Is. xlvii. 3.) Many other cases, if required, might be adduced. It is certain that among the Jews female modesty was greatly inculcated. In the temple there was a court expressly for the women.[1] Dr. Lardner, speaking of Herodias dancing before Herod and his nobles, observes, that 'it was very 'unusual for ladies of rank to appear before the men (EST. 'i. 10-12), and much less to dance at such banquets as 'these.'[2] — Paul would not allow women to speak in the assemblies of the men (1 COR. xiv. 34, 35), nor to have their head uncovered, or their veil thrown aside in divine worship[3] (1 COR. xi. 5); but to adorn themselves in modest apparel with shamefacedness and sobriety (1 TIM. ii. 9.)

[1] Jos. Hist. Wars, b. 5, c. 5, s. 2. [2] Cred. of Gosp. Hist. v. i. pt. 2. p. 23.
[3] Calmet's Dict. of Frag. No. 160.

He enjoined that every thing should be done decently (1 Cor. xiv. 40), as opposed to indecorum and impropriety, (compare Rom. xiii. 13, *Greek.*) To appear unveiled even in the streets was considered a mark of female immodesty.[1] All this being established, we hesitate not to say, that what would be regarded as immodest in our age and nation, would have been viewed as much more so among the Jews; and every argument we bring against immersion, founded on this data, applies with double force against the assumption of the apostles immersing the men and women either naked or dressed.

IV. Nor let it be supposed that when the gospel was received among the Gentiles, the dipping of married ladies, at least, in water by the other sex, would have been more in consonance with their notions of modesty. 'Grecian 'ladies,' says Rollin, 'were very reserved—seldom appeared 'in public—had separate apartments, called *Gynæcea*—and 'never ate at table with the men when strangers were pre-'sent.'[2]—Archbishop Potter tells us the same thing:—'The women of Greece rarely or never appeared in strange 'company, but were confined to the most remote parts of 'the house, in which they had distinct mansions assigned 'them; and though some husbands might be of a better 'temper, yet it was looked upon as very indecent for women 'to gad abroad.'[3] And though some laxity in this matter probably took place, in after times and in certain states, one can hardly imagine the apostles getting the said women to submit to a public dipping, without an unusual effort on their part, and no ordinary excitement on the part of the populace of the place.

[1] Comp. Bible: note on 1 Cor. xi. 5. [2] Anc. Hist. v. i. Intr. p. 54.
[3] Antiq. of Greece, v. ii p. 305; Jackson's Narr. Jour. from India, p. 32.

v. Dr. Macknight, on 1 Tim. 3, 11, observes, that 'as 'the manners of the Greeks did not permit men to have 'much intercourse with women of character, unless they 'were their relations; and as the Asiatics were under still 'greater restraints, it was proper that an order of female 'teachers should be instituted in the church for instructing 'the young of their own sex.' He then proceeds to notice several passages to establish his position. Here we gather that the aged women were to instruct the younger, because of the modesty which in general prevented men from performing this office. We learn, however, that women of rank and character, and not a few of them, believed in Paul and Silas, while preaching the gospel at Thessalonica, (Acts xvii. 4, compare with 2 John v. 1, 5.) These were in all likelihood proselytes of the Gentiles, and most assuredly had never been dipped or bathed by any man; and probably never appeared in their company without a veil. Now, is it at all likely that the apostles took these chief women, immediately on their believing, to a pond or river, and plunged them under water, in the face of a large concourse of idle spectators? Nor let it be forgotten, that baptizing-deaconesses were unheard of in the apostolic age, and arose only with the corruption of this rite: also, that the only transitive act of the minister of religion, whether Jew or Gentile, for purification or consecration, was pouring or sprinkling—to this all would have readily and cheerfully submitted; nor would any improper excitement have been produced, as we find there was not in a single instance.

vi. This argument is in no measure invalidated by the well-attested evidence respecting the profligacy of many Asiatic females—since such a charge can apply only to a certain notorious class in the community. The bashful-

ness and seclusion of the rest, is a fact placed beyond all honest contravention. The known indelicacy of one portion of the frail sisterhood, was the indirect cause of the reserve and confinement of the other. It might, indeed, be matter of grave conjecture, whether, under the influence of prevailing habits, even the ladies, least scrupulous in other respects, would, on their first listening to the apostles, and believing the truth of their message, not feel somewhat abashed at the strange proposal of being taken in the arms of a man, and publicly plunged under water.—Nor is our position enfeebled by the occasional reference of the sacred historians to the pious women who followed our Lord, associated with the disciples, or attended the ministry of the evangelists. All this is conceded, without in the least impeaching the statements previously made. For the question is not whether holy females might minister to our Lord, or sit in their compartment in the synagogue, or properly covered, in modest apparel, with shamefacedness and sobriety, unite with their husbands, parents, and relatives in divine worship; but whether, on their first believing the truth of the gospel report, when shrouded in their national habits and prejudices, they would submit to the avowedly novel, fearful, and painful operation of being publicly dipped under water by the other sex? This is the subject of enquiry—to which we answer in the negative.

VII. We would not for a moment insinuate that a scriptural institution should be sacrificed, because certain and great difficulties attend its administration—we should be unworthy of our heroic predecessors if we were not willing to surrender our lives rather than a single iota of our religious principles. But when, in our opinion, a ceremony is invented which has a tendency to arrest the progress of

the truth, we are bound to set our faces as flint against it. That this is the case with the dipping system we fearlessly aver. There are difficulties in the way of evangelizing mankind, whatever denomination attempts the glorious task. But our opponents, who must dip all the folks they bring over to their sentiments on the doctrines of the gospel, have one great obstacle unknown to other communions; and that it is a great obstacle their own concessions render unquestionable. In fact, their system is not capable of becoming universal. It stands like an impassable gulph between them and most eastern nations, where females, who in general form a majority of converts, are watched with the utmost jealousy by their husbands and fathers. Think of Baptists dipping Persian or Mahometan ladies of rank! Think of such people being taken and immersed in a river! In fact, the immersion of adult males or females is a thing unknown in any of the eastern churches however corrupted—since all are baptized in their infancy; or, if proselytes are made of persons advanced in years, the preparatory rite of going into the water and washing is always performed by themselves alone. Even the Mennonite Baptists of Holland, France, Pennsylvania, and other places, avoid the indelicacy of our opponents by baptising like ourselves by aspersion or pouring.[1]

VIII. Upon the whole we ask whether it is likely that a mode of haptism should have been instituted by Christ, which would have shocked the modesty of most virtuous women with Jewish and Grecian prejudices about them—which would have aroused all the jealousy of their husbands—and which, as a consequence, must have been a most formidable obstacle to the progress of divine truth?

[1] Rob. p. 504; Adams's View, &c. v. ii. p. 53, 63.

We answer no. And further we assert that it was not only unlikely but never attempted. We also contend, that the sooner it is abolished the better—that it has no foundation in scripture or reason, and was the invention of men labouring to enlarge and amend the institutions of Christ—and is now adopted and practised by our opponents, no doubt, with the best of motives, but, we consider, in ignorance. It is a scheme which cannot become universal as to climate nor condition. Our opponents may talk of the meaning of the word baptize, the baptism of Christ and of the Eunuch, as long as they please, the indelicacy of their rite is a valid proof to us that dipping is unscriptural.

IV. The next thing we shall mention, as a reason for believing that immersion baptism was never instituted by Christ and should not now be practised by us, is, that it destroys all devotion in the minds of most candidates for its reception. The maxim of the apostle is that we should 'attend upon the Lord without distraction,' (1 Cor. vii. 35.) But in this rite, as administered by our brethren, it is a thing next to impossible, particularly in the case of many timid and nervous females. Their mode is truly appalling to multitudes that ultimately submit: it is really 'passing through water,' and becomes a certain ordeal or test of their courage. It is formidable in prospect. Many anxious days and sleepless nights often precede this act of immersion. Many arguments are requisite to excite and perpetuate the intention of the candidate. 'Fears of various 'kind' are alive, and apprehension revels in an entire dominion over the subjugated spirits. And when the people are brought to the point, the preparation is so great, dresses must be made or borrowed, some great thing is to be done; then there is the rattling of the pump, or the drawers of

water filling the font; then a crowd is expected and collected in the chapel, these jump on the seats, climb the pillars, and cram the galleries, to witness what is to be done to a lady whose habits are perhaps the most retiring, and whose fears of indecorum or accident are all awake. Instead of being sweetly composed and in a devotional frame of mind, she feels like a person about to be exhibited to the crowd, and to act a part at which all will stare and many will smile. Our brethren, indeed, tell us, that 'it generates 'seriousness, enflames devotion, and animates hope.'[1] But the reverse is more generally, if not always, the result. We say there is no devotion in her mind before the act, certainly none while under water, and very little when she ascends dripping, and is hurried breathless into the vestry to change her clothes. And if you compare the state of her mind while sitting at the Lord's table, partaking of the emblems of a Redeemer's love, the contrast is perfect. We would ask what solemn and serene devotion marked the mind of the lady who was dipped almost by force, or of those who fainted in the minister's arms, or became motionless in the baptistry? Our opponents may ridicule what they term baby-sprinkling as destitute of solemnity; but if we are not greatly mistaken their own system is a hundred times more so. Now, if such be the state of the case in our country, where the ladies have so many precedents and contrivances, how much greater perturbation of mind must have seized the first women, laid hold of by the harbinger of Christ, to dip them into the deep and rapid river of Jordan? What sage and queer observations must have proceeded from the first spectators of such a dipping? If John actually immersed the people, he was the first that ever did

[1] Anderson's Introd. p. 8.

so; 'for there never was any such thing as [immersion] 'baptism in practice before the time of John.'[1]

V. But there are difficulties which particularly apply to the persons officiating—and those of various descriptions. Baptist ministers are subject to sickness and disease in common with other people—now for them to stand up to the middle in water while baptizing thirty, forty, or fifty persons, as is sometimes the case, and that after preaching a sermon on this animating topic, till heated and bathed with perspiration, is enough to cause their death. All, indeed, may not suffer alike from it, and many not at all; but others pay dearly for their temerity. For ministers who dread the idea of getting damp in their feet, and who, to guard against it, wear thick shoes with cork soles, lamb's-wool socks, and calashes, whose rooms are thickly carpetted, and rendered air tight, with a comfortable fire—for them to stand an hour or more, knee deep in cold water, even in Summer, must expose them to chills and rheumatisms—if nothing worse ensue. So great, indeed, is the danger on their present plan, that some of their ablest pastors are said to be afraid of baptizing at all. As our brethren plead the customs of antiquity in defence of their mode, we may safely recommend them to copy the example of the Pope and baptize the people in wax or oil-skin pantaloons. Or if, as good Protestants, they do not like to borrow from his holiness at Rome, they may guard themselves from much harm by imitating the excellent Dr. Ryland, and wear mud-boots under their cloaks, which, if well tied or buttoned, may not appear to the curious congregation. Further, many Baptist ministers are not the stoutest and strongest of their kind. Suppose then that certain men and women we could name—not

[1] Rob. Hist. p. 29.

to mention Lambert, Bright, or O'Brien, nor the ladies most admired on the banks of the Senegal, were to apply to some of our weak brethren for immersion, in what convenient or decent manner could they dip them under water and raise them out afterwards; and, as Mr. Burt says, 'feel a vast 'deal of pleasure therein?' Must they not look about them for some more muscular aid—write a note to some athletic brother to officiate on this perplexing occasion, or get people near the baptistry in readiness to assist in the resurrection of this great man or woman? It is probable that, in reference to this topic, one of our opponents candidly alludes, when he says, 'sometimes also the unseemly 'manner of some of our brethren, in performing this rite, 'has given a rude shock to inveterate prejudice, and 'created much disgust or aversion.'[1]—We have no reason to suppose that John the Baptist was a priest of more than ordinary strength or stature, nor are the disciples of Christ celebrated as apparent descendants of Og or Goliah; and as for Paul, he seems to have been a person of diminitive stature and little bodily strength, (2 Cor. x. 10.) How then did they manage matters in that jealous age, and where it is said the stoutest and fattest ladies were deemed the greatest beauties, and where, of course, they would not be abstemious for the sake of being slender? Our brethren who dwell so largely on scripture precedents can probably tell us. The fact is, men may be well qualified for preaching the gospel, administering the other Christian sacrament, be excellent pastors, and every way fitted for good ministers of Jesus Christ, and not be able to baptize their people by immersion. We infer, therefore, that dipping is not Chris-

[1] Lecture on Baptism, by Evans, &c. p. 127.

tian baptism, and that pouring or sprinkling being universally feasible, is the only scriptural and proper mode.

VI. There are further difficulties arising from the state of the climate and the peculiar habits of a people. Our opponents sometimes speak of Judea as if it were always the most sultry province under heaven—and the manners of the Jews, as if they were like some amphibious creatures, living half their time in the water.[1] We know, from the highest authority, that the winters in Palestine and the neighbourhood are exceedingly cold—so much so, that people have lost their lives amidst its frosts and snows,[2] and whole armies have been arrested and defeated by the severity of the weather.[3] Even in the summer their nights are often severely cold, (GEN. xxxi. 40; JOB xxxvii. 6; PSALMS lxxviii. 48; cxlvii. 16, 17; PROV. xx. 4; xxv. 13; NEH. iii. 17; JOHN xviii. 18.) This must have rendered public baptism by immersion frequently impracticable. 'I 'would fain know,' asks Mr. Rees, 'what they did in the 'land of Canaan and in other eastern countries, in cold 'weather, for they have frost and snow in their seasons 'there?' We could have easily told him—they baptized the people by pouring or sprinkling. We never read that the bleakness of the weather ever prevented the converts of any description from being baptized immediately and on the spot where they were addressed, whether it were hot or cold, wet or dry; for, as Mr. Robinson observes, 'there 'was no intermediate state of scholarship—baptism was 'administered immediately on conviction of the truth of the 'report.'—Now, that all the people consecrated by the

[1] See Booth, v. i. p. 250 [2] Harmer's Obs. c. 1, obs. 11, 12, 16, 17, 35.
[3] Prideaux Con. v. iii. p. 371; Jos. Ant. b. 13, c. 6, s. 6; b. 14, c. 14, s. 12.]
[4] P. 147.

apostles, who appear never to have intermitted their exertions on account of the weather in Winter or Summer, should have been dipped under cold water, is truly incredible—especially the delicate parts of society—honourable women, nursed in the lap of comfort—or sickly persons, who must 'have run the hazard of instant death.' In this and other northern nations, such a method, if God prefers mercy to sacrifice, could not have been universally imperative in the Christian church. Were a Baptist minister to visit the Hebrides at Christmas, and convert a hundred Highlanders, and, following what he calls scripture precedent, baptize them there and then, in the open air, plunging the lairds and ladies, the old and young, male and female, the sane and the sickly, in natural rivers, in one minute their clothes would be stiff with the frost and their bodies armed with icicles at every point. How would they carry their notions into effect at Hudson's Bay, in the month of January? Warming water, or waiting till Summer, is a practice for which our opponents can plead no scripture precedent, and is done now, not as apostolical, but through policy, and becomes only a part of what they call 'will-'worship.'

VII. We shall mention another difficulty arising from the impossibility of always ascertaining whether the person dipped is perfectly baptized. It appears requisite for them, that the people should be wetted all over or entirely—no part being exempted. To say with Dr. Gill,[1] that, having been under water, is enough, would render it problematical whether coming in contact with the element at all was requisite. And if they do not maintain that a universal wetting is necessary, they would not know where to draw the

[1] P. 217.

line between a due and an invalid administration. Suppose but the top of the thumb or of the great toe were, per accident, not brought in contact with the water, the ceremony is valid, or it is not. If valid, then suppose the whole thumb and great toe, were to escape the cleansing touch, would the rite be still valid? If they answer yes, then we ask—suppose the hand and foot are unfortunate enough to escape, is it valid then? Here they hesitate—because they perceive 'whereunto this thing would grow'—since we naturally argue, if but a small part of the body may escape the water with absolute impunity, why not a trifle more? and if this trifle, why not another, till we came to merely dipping the head, or even to the foolish practice of pouring or sprinkling! —A Baptist minister gave a man a second plunge, because in the first a small part of his face, probably the protuberance called a nose, was not under the element! In one instance, a deacon applied to a lady, to have her dipped afresh, because he saw some of her clothes floating above the water while her body was under! There appears to be no settled medium between an entire wetting and an indifferent application of water to any one part of the body. This our opponents have long felt; and with an eye to such an entire saturation, the remark of Maimonides, who lived nearly twelve hundred years after Christ, is so often reiterated in the writings of our respected brethren:—'Where-'ever in the law washing of the flesh or of clothes [which, by 'the bye, was not baptism][1] is mentioned, it means nothing 'else but the dipping of the whole body in water; for if any 'man wash himself all over, except the top of his little fin-'ger, he is still in his uncleanness.'—Robinson adds, that 'when a female proselyte was purified, some dipped them-

[1] Rob. p. 35, 36, 39; Cox, p. 36.

'selves naked, others in a thin garment that would admit the 'water every where; but none in any habit that might 'prevent the water from wetting all the body—for if only 'a small defluction [or tear] from the eye ran between the 'water and the skin, the purification was judged partial 'and incomplete.'[1] — The design of this citation is very evident, though of no authority in this debate. Now, is it not very possible that, in a sudden immersion and an instantaneous emersion, water may not get between all the dress and the skin, especially when the person baptized wears stockings, shoes, caps, bandages, and several garments one over another? We now ask again, is baptism complete, though the wetting be not universal? If it be, then a partial wetting is sufficient; and, if this be true, who is to decide to what extent the person is to be wetted? This is the difficulty suggested; and the reference to the Rabbi goes for nothing. If they say it is not complete, and that an entire wetting is necessary—then, we ask, how do our brethren know that those they dip under water are wet in every part? This is another difficulty; and if they have no proper means of knowing, they are uncertain whether any of their church-members are properly baptized, or, according to Dr. Gale's ideas, 'baptized at all.' To say that the body was all under water, will not do; and even this, with floating dresses, becomes uncertain, without wands to sink the clothes. A person is literally and truly under water when ho walks in a heavy shower, or even stands, like Nebuchadnezzar, in the fields under the descending dew, or when he carries a pail of water on his head. The truth is, that, according to the system we are combatting, a complete drenching is essential to a due

[1] Rob. p. 32, 38.

administration of this rite among our opponents—but to ascertain when it is effected, is always exceedingly difficult—since many are not more entirely wetted—to say nothing of being washed by immersion—than they are by by pouring or sprinkling. Let our friends remove this difficulty, if they can.

VIII. Before we conclude this article, it may be proper to notice an observation frequently made by our opponents, and hinted at before in this discourse. They say that 'many Pedobaptists agree with them in sentiment, and yet, 'through shame or fear, refuse to take up the cross and 'submit to the operation.'[1]—Mr. Gibbs observes, 'nor 'are there wanting many in communion with Independent 'churches, who are compelled to acknowledge that we are 'right; yet, from motives of policy or self-indulgence, they 'decline to follow the Lord through this despised ordi-'nance. The number of these *dry Baptists*, as they may 'be called, is by no means inconsiderable—they are to be 'found in almost all societies of professing Christians.'[2]—In reply to these remarks, we observe—

1. That it is possible for many among us to make blunders similar to those of our antagonists, respecting the original practice of baptism, without feeling any powerful obligation to adopt the same in the present age and country. Of this changing or omitting what they think a primitive mode, our opponents have furnished them with several pertinent examples. Consequently, for the Baptists to claim as dippers all who suppose that Christ and his followers were plunged, is preposterous. Whatever ideas these 'dry Baptists' may have formed, respecting the action adopted by John the Baptist and the apostles of our Lord,

[1] See Cox, Pref. p. 6; Booth, v. iii. p. 118, 119. [2] P. 14.

they conscientiously regard the application of water to the body in any form, as the essence of the rite; and consider that it may be done in accordance with the will of God, in a way that shall be most seemly and convenient amidst the various habits and manners of mankind. These are, therefore, as much for pouring or sprinkling as ourselves.

II. When our good friends talk of rejecting *their* baptism through 'self-indulgence,' and of its being 'a cross' too heavy for many pious and conscientious Christians to take up, they seem to forget that *scripture* baptism is never called a difficulty, nor designated a cross by the apostles, nor by any individual who was baptized in their day—no, not in the coldest season, nor in reference to any kind of person, the most delicate or fearful. We never read that any one, however nervous, sickly, unaccustomed to bathe, or ill provided with change of raiment, or surrounded by a ridiculing crowd, complained of baptism in any place as a difficulty or a cross. Whatever mode the apostles observed, it was perfectly consistent with the condition and feelings of all the people who submitted to it. What does this imply, but that, though modern immersion is a cross which comparatively few of the Baptists themselves take up without trepidation of mind, there was none as the rite was administered in the first age of the Christian church, when dipping would have been a ten-fold heavier cross than in the present day, and that the modes of the apostles and of our opponents are very materially different?

III. That to be baptized by immersion is a cross, we readily admit; but of this we are persuaded, that no pious Pedobaptist refrains from carrying it merely on account of its weight. He brings the difficulty of dipping as an argument for its non-institution, or non-obligation now; but

only make it plain that it is a divine obligation or an imperative duty for him to be dipped, and he will submit, though it cost him his existence. This Christian heroism of Pedobaptists, and their devotion to what they consider a religious obligation, have been exemplified in their undergoing a thousand hardships, and in suffering the loss of all things, and even of life itself, rather than sacrifice their conscience on the altar of comfort or conveniency. To say that they are neglecting compliance with an acknowledged and present imperative claim through fear of the font, is little less than a libel on their piety and devotedness to the cause of God. A person may indeed suppose that immersion was the primitive mode—he may even think it the better method now; but to imagine that a true follower of Christ considers dipping as the only mode and essential to a profession of the gospel, and yet will not submit, is what we are unwilling to believe—at any rate, none but those who are Baptists in principle, and consequently Baptists in reality, can be regarded as feeling the lash of our opponents' insinuation. But, alas! as Dr. Campbell remarks, 'such is the presumption of vain man, (of which bad 'quality the weakest judgments have commonly the 'greatest share), that it is with difficulty any one person 'can be brought to think, that any other person has, or 'can have, as strong conviction of a different set of opi-'nions, as he has of his.'[1]

[1] Lect. on Ecc. Hist. lect. 24.

SECTION EIGHTH.

THE DANGER OF DIPPING IN MANY CASES.

The present branch of our subject is nearly allied to the preceding and may be regarded as a continuance of it. This investigation, besides being a fair subject of enquiry, where the circumstances of baptism are considered the only evidence of real importance in the debate, is forced upon us by various observations on the other side of the question. Our opponents repeatedly assure us, either that no person ever received the least harm from being plunged into the water in baptism—or that if he did, it must have been for want of skill in the baptizer or of faith in the baptized. A Baptist, speaking in defence of dipping, lately mentioned one person in particular who had been cured of some complaint by immersion. Recourse is often had to the benefit of bathing as an argument for dipping in baptism—at least, as an evidence of its harmlessness. Nor is this kind of reasoning confined to conversation. Mr. Keach tells us of 'an ancient women in Kent that was bed-ridden some time, 'who could not be satisfied until she was baptized—and 'baptised she was—and upon it grew strong and went about, 'and lived some years after in health and strength accord-'ing to her age.'[1] Mr. Booth adduces another instance: 'Mary Welch, aged eleven days, was baptized by Mr. 'Wesley, according to the custom of the Church of Eng-'land, by immersion.—The child was ill then and recov-'ered from that hour.'[2] Mr. Joseph Stennett says, 'Many 'infirm persons have declared that they have found, after

[1] P. 257. [2] Vol. i. p. 196.

'their immersion, a sensible advancement of their health.' He also relates, from Socrates and Augustine, that three persons, one a paralytic, another having the gout, and the other afflicted with palsy, were cured by immersion—and adds, that though these cases were deemed miraculous, infirm people may learn from them not to scruple at being dipped[1]—that is, they may hope similar miracles will be wrought in their case. Dr. Cheyne and Sir John Floyer, two eminent physicians, are referred to, as attesting the benefits of bathing, and the wisdom and mercy of God in appointing immersion baptism.[2] But whether these gentlemen refer to the dipping of infants or adults is not explained; nor is it said whether such a wonderful advantage was to be obtained from a single dip or from repeated immersions; nor at what time of the year, nor under what circumstances this medicinal operation may be best performed. These indefinite sentiments, however, are triumphantly adduced by the Baptists to establish the bodily blessings derived from dipping. Hence Dr. Gill would have people converted in the winter, and under consumptions, catarrhs, &c. to be baptized by immersion immediately—and assigns the following reason for his advice:—'perhaps it may be of use 'to them for the restoration of their health.'[3] Now it is but fair to meet this specious argument by a similar process of reasoning. Nor can they justly complain of our strictures since they have taught us the way and forced the discussion upon us. Provided our narrative of cases be equally credible with their own, and our deduction from facts placed on a similar footing, it would be very inconsistent in them to complain of this species of argumentation in the mainte-

[1] P. 131, 171. [2] Newman's Baptismal Immersion, p. 16.
[3] P. 229.

nance of our position. But let us proceed to examine this subject:—

I. We have no hesitation in admitting the veracity of the facts before narrated. We, however, decidedly object to the inferences as illigetimate and invalid. We do not deny that dipping some diseased people might, by the shock, produce restoration. But then this effect is merely incidental and fortuitous—what was not intended by the minister nor expected by the baptized. The question is, whether dipping people indefinitely into cold water, as done in immersion-baptism, has a natural tendency to benefit or restore their health? We answer, certainly not—for though in many cases, individuals may be dipped with impunity, and a few may even receive advantage from it, the probable result is pernicious to the human constitution. In examining causes and effects, we are not to regard accidental productions, but such as, all things considered, may be fairly expected. In this calculation and under certain circumstances we may be mistaken, and that for want of discovering, the precise relation between the means and the end. A person has been known to take poison to destroy life, and has unexpectedly removed disease—the fright of a house on fire has aroused a bed-ridden gentleman and restored him to the perfect use of his previously paralized limbs. It is said a fright will often cure the ague. Besides, imagination may, in this instance, as in Catholic communions, often effect a cure on a superstitious mind. But these are accidental results, and such as few would have anticipated. We might put it to the judgment of any sensible Baptist, whether taking a person in health unaccustomed to bathe, and putting him or her under water, has not a natural tendency to produce a chill, which is the precursor of our most fatal

diseases? This might be looked for, especially in the case of delicate people dipped in their clothes, during the winter season, and after a considerable excitement of mind, producing a feverish state of the body? None but a person having a special end to answer would reply in the negative. We may, therefore, conclude, that to be dipped is 'to take 'up the cross,' is sometimes 'inconvenient and dangerous,' and 'running the hazard of instant death;' and when medicinal cure is effected by the plunge, it is related as an occurrence of the most remarkable kind, and set down by great men as a species of 'miracle:' whereas the opposite effects are generally looked for, and frequently found. It should be also remembered that a potion, which had been the means of killing six persons and of curing half a dozen, would be universally regarded as extremely dangerous—and ten times as many arguments may be fairly employed against its reception as there could be for it.

II. The bathing commended by physicians is very different from the immersion of our opponents. Some are allowed only a warm bath, and others are commanded to wash themselves in the tepid wave—some in salt water—others in fresh—nor do they recommend all the persons in a town to bathe—nor any without respect to proper seasons of the year. Physicians, in recommending bathing, do not suppose that any great or permanent benefit can be derived from a single immersion—the act must be repeated several times a week—and that perhaps for several months together. To suppose that good can be obtained by one dip, is to display the credulity of magic, rather than the sober judgment of reason. In bathing, the person is requested, first, to wet the head and upper parts of the body, and not to stand a considerable time up to the knees or

middle in cold water, driving the blood to the brain and heart with extreme violence.[1] But in modern immersion, all must be dipped—cold water must be the element, though the supposed apostolic example is sometimes dispensed with, and the chill taken off. This is only a single plunge, and after standing with the legs in the element no inconsiderable time. This is to be done in all countries and at all seasons of the year. Let us hear their own words :— Mr. Keach says, 'I have myself baptized many hundreds of 'men and women, and some at all times of the year; yea, 'in the times of bitter frost and snow, where the ice was first 'broken; and persons that were of a weak and sickly con-'stitution, and women big with child, and others near 'seventy years old, and some near eighty.'[2]—This description accords with the practice of most genuine Baptists. But it is what no physician in his senses would advise. He would be shocked, were he, on going his rounds of a morning, to learn that all his patients were on that day to be dipped into cold water. In fact, it is no uncommon thing for respectable people, before they are baptized, to consult their medical attendants, to ascertain whether an immersion is likely to prove injurious to their health. Such are the apprehensions of Baptists themselves; and no wonder—since they feel that damp feet, damp linen, or exposure to a shower of rain, are often pernicious to their constitution. Even Sir J. Floyer says, 'cold bathing is 'not proper to be used when persons are hot or sweating :' and Dr. Cheyne advises, that 'cold bathing should never 'be used under a fit of chronical distemper, with a quick 'pulse, or with a head-ache, or by those that have weak

[1] See Dr. Unwin's Essay on Sea-Bathing, Sp. and Man. of the Age, Dec. 1829.
[2] P. 257.

'lungs,' &c.[1] —The assumption that no evil will occur to them, while acting in what they deem the way of truth, is frivolous—since, first, if our remarks are just, they have zeal without knowledge—and, secondly, because, as you will presently hear, people every way sincere have paid dearly for their dipping.—The innoxious nature or even the advantage of dipping infants, is vainly adduced in defence of plunging adults—since many a Baptist mother would have no objection to wash her baby, or even to dip it in cold water, but who would feel considerable reluctance to be served the same herself—for, while it might strengthen the screaming child, it would probably injure the timid mamma. It should also be remembered, that an argument in support of immersion, founded on the medicinal advantages or even the harmless tendency of dipping, is a manifest departure from the only ground on which the dipping system of our opponents is said to rest, chiefly, if not entirely, on the import of the word baptize, and an uncompromising adherence to what they consider apostolical example and scripture precept: whereas, by resting our scheme on circumstantial evidence, every difficulty and danger in the practice of plunging becomes a fair and valid auxiliary to our position.

III. What is intimated respecting accidents arising from want of skill in the baptizer, or of faith in the baptized, while it tacitly concedes the existence of evil consequences, contains nothing in the form of a fair argument. With regard to the *former*, it may be safely presumed, that the minister does his best; and, consequently does all that we could honestly require of him. But when a little man is called upon to dip a lady or a gentleman, whose person he

[1] Gill, p. 257.

can little more than half embrace with his outstretched arms, and the weight of whose person laughs at his feeble loins, if accidents follow, the cause must rather be in the system than in the operator. That there may be a want of skill in the first essays of Baptist ministers, as in the supposed case of John the Baptist and others in primitive times, to whom dipping one another was a novelty, we will not deny; but generally it is a want of muscle, for which they are not accountable. The dangers to which we allude, however, do not consist in any catastrophes in the baptistry, but in the natural result of immersion in certain cases, though most dextrously and gracefully performed. To be let fall into the water a second time, or to be kept under it too long, are evils to be sure, but not within the range of our immediate contemplation. The dangerous tendency of dipping all kinds of people, under all kinds of circumstances, and during all seasons of the year, is what we especially allude to, and not the bungles of a feeble or unskilful brother, who, while doing his best, does it badly. With regard to the *latter*—a want of faith in the baptized—let it be observed that this, coming from the lips of those who have been dipped without suffering from it, sounds a little egotistic:—'We did not sustain any injury because of our faith.' If it be the doctrine of mere catechumens, we say they are arguing on the erroneous principles of Job's miserable comforters, who supposed that people's trials in this life kept pace with their sins. Besides, how do they account for the thousands, who, without piety, are baptized, and yet experience no evil consequences from it. Such persons were likely to suffer dreadfully; and the font would have been to them like the watery ordeal of former times, and indeed a test of the reality of their religion. One has hardly

patience to hear the arguments of many Baptists; and yet, being broached with confidence, and believed with implicitness, must be noticed in strictures of this nature.

IV. We would again remind you, that we by no means intend to compromise truth, by exhibiting the dangers of holding it. When the path of duty is plain, we are to walk in it, regardless of consequences, which are to be left with God. Nor shall we refer to the facts before us, as demonstrative proof that immersion-baptism is not scriptural. Many duties are enjoined in the Word of God which involve considerable risk; but being unequivocally commanded, we have no deliberate choice how to act, nor any ground for receding, though obliged to take our lives in our hand and suffer the loss of all things, even of existence itself. Having shown, we presume to your satisfaction, that immersion-baptism is not inculcated by precept nor exhibited in apostolic example, or, in other words, that it is not scriptural, we adduce the dangers of being dipped, in reply to the suggestions of our opponents—as an indirect evidence that such a method was not likely to be imposed by the Author of our religion—and to show that the sooner it is abolished the better: or, to employ the reasoning of Mr. Booth, 'were it evinced that infants [or adults] cannot bear 'plunging, without the hazard of health and of life; it 'would only be a presumptive argument [and this it would 'be] against their claim to the ordinance; and the greater 'the danger, the stronger the presumption.'[1] — It may, indeed, be recognized as an invariable rule in the divine procedure, that when the Redeemer calls his people to some dangerous enterprise, or to suffer on account of professing the gospel, he has not only adequate reasons for it, but such

[1] Vol. I. p. 311.

as he clearly discovers to them for their encouragement and support. In other cases, it seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to the apostles being assembled in council at Jerusalem, to lay upon believers no other burden than things absolutely necessary, (Acts xv. 2, 25, 28.) To apply this to the case before us :—If immersion be really a cross, inconvenient and dangerous, and is sometimes running the 'hazard of instant death,' where are the clear and adequate reasons for undergoing it? It is allowed by most of our opponents themselves, that it is not 'necessary to salva-'tion'—that a credible profession of faith may be made without it—that it adds nothing to the real happiness nor piety of the individual—that it does no good to those that are without—in fact, that it is a needless exposure of the church—and stands, therefore, in opposition to all the known rules of divine Providence. It is putting a yoke on the neck of the saints, which is of no apparent advantage to themselves, the church, or the world.

V. It is proper here to observe, that instances of danger and disease connected with dipping are not in general easily got at. The victims of immersion are interested in keeping their afflictions a secret—since an exposure would subject them to observations and jeers from their irreligious neighbours. The denomination at large is also interested in covering up the matter—since the development might be injurious to their communion. Hence other causes are assigned to account for the consequences which too often follow the administration of this rite among our opponents. Indeed, to have half the cases known, which, we hesitate not to say, certainly occur, would be a death-blow to their system.—If we can disclose a few well-attested facts to the point, and exhibit them as specimens of all the rest, you

can require no more to enter into, and to feel the force of, the argument now pressed upon your attention. Should it be thought more instances ought to be offered than we are about to present, we can confidently state that they are available in considerable numbers.

Our opponents have stated several cures arising from immersion, and have assumed that dipping was the cause of such amended health. Now, on their own principles, we of course may reason, that if a person in health is dipped into cold water, and, from that time, becomes ill, this illness was the consequence of such a dipping; or, if after this illness, and in the space of a few weeks, he dies, that the dipping was the cause of his death. This is the way a jury would reason—it is the way our opponents judge in the reversed argument—and as they would conclude, if, after sprinkling several people, they were immediately attacked with erysipelas or apoplexy—or, if a person is unwell, and, after being immersed, becomes worse and dies, we may justly conclude that death was, at least, accelerated by it. On this ground they derive an argument in support of their scheme, and, if our cases are equally authentic, we shall not be subject to reproof for standing and reasoning on a similar basis.

VI. We shall now proceed to notice the dangers of immersion. These may be considered, as apprehended, temporary and fatal.

1. *Danger is often apprehended.*—That this is the fact we have previously asserted; and, from our own knowledge, and perhaps some present, from their own feelings, can fully testify. We could name Baptists who never submit to this ceremony, through a dread of the operation and fear of the consequences—who deprive themselves of commu-

nion with the church, and of all membership in the society, through this apprehension alone. How many Baptist ministers, while able to preach, visit the sick, administer the Lord's Supper, and the like, are afraid, especially under certain circumstances, to baptize their converts? It is well observed by an opponent, that, 'in this country, bathing is 'not considered, except by a few individuals, as an enjoy-'ment, and many think of it with reluctance.'[1] — And if this be the case with bathing in the Summer, under all the favourable circumstances usually concurring to render such an operation pleasant—what reluctance must most people feel to be dipped by a second person, in cold weather, and before a gazing, and perhaps ungodly, congregation?— A Baptist remarks, 'there are persons of weak nerves and 'much hysterical excitability; and there are some who pos-'sess, so to speak, a kind of hydrophobic timidity;' to whom a public dipping before 'a staring (perhaps a pro-'fane) multitude,' must be dreadful.[2] Hence it is, as one of their own poets has said, in respect of those who approach the baptismal font, they—

'With trembling steps attend,
'Oppressed with fears of various kind.'[3]

Or, to employ the language of Dr. Watts, with a verbal alteration—

'But tim'rous mortals start and shrink,
'To tempt this narrow sea;
'And linger, shiv'ring on the brink,
'And fear to launch away.'

They feel, as Dr. Ryland justly remarks, that 'they are 'about to be immersed in that element, beneath which, if 'they were to continue a short time, death must ensue;'[4] and not knowing positively how long they shall have to

[1] Rob. p. 50. [2] Lect. on Bapt. by Evans, &c. p. 128.
[3] Fellow's Hymns, p. 67. [4] P. 27.

continue, they feel a little backward in being put beneath at all. Observe, also, the many encouraging sentences dropped by the minister at the baptistry, to inspire the timid with confidence—such as 'Fear not to descend into 'this watery grave: you will soon emerge from thence;'[1] and words of strength are put into their mouths and echoed by the initiated audience—

> 'We will no longer trembling stand,
> 'But boldly plunge beneath the flood.'[2]

But let us relate a couple of facts already before the public. 'A certain pious female, in a dangerous state of health, and 'deeply impressed with the conviction that she should not 'live long, requested that she might partake of the Lord's 'Supper with a Baptist communion. The answer was, No— 'unless she would be immersed. To which she replied, 'that I cannot possibly do. I can scarcely walk—the shock 'would be too great for my poor body—therefore, if you 'will not suffer me to receive the sacrament without im- 'mersion, the responsibility rests with you.'[3]

'Another lady, far advanced in the family-way, had a 'deep impression that she should not survive her confine- 'ment, and requested that she might receive the sacrament 'of the Lord's Supper—but was answered, as in the pre- 'ceding case, not unless she would be first immersed. To 'which she replied, that, I believe would be my death and 'the death of the infant, and since you compel me to die 'in the neglect of a commandment in which all Christians 'are agreed, see that you answer for it.'[4]

II. *There is temporary danger.*—That many people suffer materially from baptizing others, or from being bap-

[1] Ryland, p. 31. [2] Fellow's Hymns, p. 60.
[3] Scripture Reasons, &c. p. 124. [4] Ibid.

tized themselves, is a fact which few persons acquainted with the human constitution and the Baptist denomination will presume to doubt. Cases of this kind are frequently brought under our notice, notwithstanding all the efforts to hide them. Indeed, the precautions taken, on many occasions, are evidently founded on a knowledge that disease has often been the consequence of implicitly following what our brethren consider the practice of the primitive age. Such as warming the water, having fires in the vestry, giving the baptized spirits and water as soon as they are able to drink, the hurried manner of changing their wet dresses, the minister's wearing mud or boatmen's boots, or something answerable to them, with various preventives of disease. The very adoption of these measures implies, that accidents have ensued, since on no other ground could they rest their observance. To use umbrellas in a country where it never rained, would be no more inconsistent than for our opponents to guard against dangers which never occurred. Whatever some theoretic Baptists may say respecting God's preserving his people in the path of duty, and that none ever suffered from being dipped, while it is contrary to fact, also opposes the judgment of well-taught practitioners, whose precautions fully develop their sentiments on this subject. But let us apply to facts, and give one respecting the baptized and another respecting the baptizer ; these will be sufficient as specimens: if more cases are needed to establish our position, they are easily forthcoming :—

'A young woman was dipped a short time since with 'every possible care. The effect, however, was an imme-'diate imflammation of the throat, which placed her life for 'a time in very critical circumstances. The Baptist friends 'provided her with medicine, gruel, and other necessaries,

'in a very kind, though a very snug manner. She was ill 'a considerable while, but ultimately recovered.' This case is well authenticated. The other, to be mentioned, is equally so :—

'The Rev. Mr. P., of W., preached a sermon in his 'own chapel, prior to baptizing two or three persons. Being 'somewhat animated, as our brethren mostly are on such 'an occasion, he was thrown into a great perspiration. He 'then descended from the pulpit and entered the baptistry, 'where he stood a considerable while up to the knees in 'water. A surgeon present declared that he expected his 'death would be the effect of his imprudence. The folks 'being dipped, the minister came up out of the water, 'shifted his clothes, retired to his house, about half-a-mile 'distant, was taken ill, went to bed, and his life was in 'imminent danger for several weeks—and, for three months, 'he was unable to attend on the work of the ministry.'

Here an observation suggested by the last recital should be made. The method commonly pursued by our opponents, of one preaching and another baptizing, in order to avoid the probable evil consequences on the health of the officiator, is a precaution of which we read not a word in the holy writings. He that preached in the days of Christ and immediately after, had no sooner by his appeals induced the people to submit to baptism, than he himself actually baptized them. Though his discourse were long, his mind animated, his body heated, his audience large, and the weather unfavourable, there was no intermediate delay, nor were other persons appointed to the work of dipping. John preached and baptized—the Saviour sent his disciples to preach and baptize—and this system was invariably adopted—and yet we discover no instance of the preacher's

suffering from the administration as then performed—nor of the chills, sore throats, or the like, of the baptized, who, in heated and almost suffocated crowds, listened to the sermon, and were baptized immediately. A plausible argument surely, that the mode of the primitive church and that of our opponents differ essentially from each other.

III. *There are fatal consequences.*—We shall select those on which an implicit reliance can be placed in respect both of the fact and the induction from it. We have heard of many more, well authenticated, and on the narrators of which the fullest reliance might be placed. Those we shall mention are related by pious and intelligent ministers, who are doubtless ready to vouch for the truth of their reports. We shall notice those only in which the connexion between dipping and death is clearly discovered; for instances may arise where a person is immersed and dies shortly after, and yet the link of the chain which unites these events may not be discernible. To illustrate what we mean—we will recite a case:—'The Rev. Mr. R., of B., was sometime ago urging 'upon his hearers the necessity of an immediate conversion 'to God, and enforced the point by the following remark-'able anecdote:—"I very lately baptized a person on a 'Thursday, and he was a corpse on the following Sabbath." Now, it does not appear whether this person was in dying circumstances when dipped, or whether he died from some accident on the Lord's Day, or whether his death was caused or accelerated by the operation on the Thursday. Our conjecture would lead us to the last conclusion; but still it is only conjecture. The instances we shall cite are conclusive—at least as much so as those we read of in the works of our opponents.

1. The Rev. Mr. W. says, 'my friend Mr. G. took cold

'by immersion, and was brought into a consumption, of 'which he died. I then endeavoured, with all my soul, to 'drown my convictions by overpowering the evidence with 'the advice: We must not say it was so, for it will bring 'disgrace upon the ways of God. But I have been com- 'pelled to alter my opinion [as a Baptist minister] and of 'course my practice.'[1]

2. The Rev. Mr. R., late of S., relates that 'a young 'woman resident in the same town, was persuaded to be 'baptized by immersion—to which she consented. The 'time was fixed without her knowledge, and she under- 'went the ceremony. The consequence was that she took 'a violent chill, was seized with shivering fits, and in eight 'and forty hours was a corpse.'

3. The Rev. Mr. F., of L., and other ministers, relate that 'a gentleman was immersed a short time ago at P. He was 'taken out of the water, staggered back into the vestry, and 'dropped dead in the place, of an apoplectic fit. A jury sat 'over his body on the spot, and two eminent physicians 'gave it as their decided opinion that his death was caused 'by a rush of blood to the head, in consequence of dip- 'ping his feet and legs into the cold water. The jury were 'of the same opinion and returned a verdict accordingly.

4. The Rev. Mr. J. W. B., of W., says, that 'a young 'woman at C. N., was induced, by the arguments of the 'Baptists, to be immersed. She was perfectly well before, 'but immediately after was taken dangerously ill, went into 'a consumption, and in the space of a few months expired.'

5. The Rev. Mr. L., late of W., relates the following melancholy event:—'A young woman was lately baptized 'in that place, by immersion, the consequence was an im-

[1] Scripture Reasons, &c. p. 124.

'mediate illness, of which she died in about a fortnight after, 'to the great grief of her relatives and the sad mortification 'of the Baptists.'

6. The Rev. Mr. J., of A., mentioned a similar catastrophe, which lately occurred in the town where he resides: 'A young female was dipped into cold water by the Bap- 'tist minister, from which she took a severe chill, and, in 'the space of a very few weeks, gave up the ghost.'

VII. On these well attested though melancholy relations, few comments are requisite—your own reflections will supply every deficiency of the speaker. This is certain, that dangers apprehended, temporary, and fatal, are the frequent precursor and attendants of the system we are opposing, and which our respected brethren, in the face of all these facts, maintain with so much eloquence and zeal. The inference is easy and natural—that unless we have the most decided and unquestionable proof that immersion baptism was not only practised in the first Christian churches, but of its being now and ever imperative on all believers of all climates, constitutions, ages, and circumstances, we ought not to submit to it ourselves nor countenance the method in others. That it was not the practice of the first churches we presume to have convinced you—that it was not to be observed in after-times we also think has been made apparent, and that it is not obligatory on us, we consider fully established. To be immersed in baptism, therefore, is not only unscriptural, but flying needlessly in the face of danger—exposing our health and lives through a zeal for God without a proper knowledge of his word.

To enlarge on the medicinal advantages of dipping as an evidence in favour of immersion baptism, is perfectly inconclusive. A few people might, by the fright of a plunge,

be benefitted under some very peculiar circumstances—but the question is, what are the legitimate tendencies of dipping all kinds and degrees of persons, at all seasons of the year, people nursed in a closet and scarcely ever exposed before to wet feet or a pelting shower? We say, most decidedly pernicious. The order of nature may indeed be reversed in particular cases—a dose of poison might be received into a disordered stomach and cure it—the alarm of a fire might raise a paralytic from his couch and restore him to health—and so might a plunge into a baptistry. But these results would be accidental and unexpected—and such as were never contemplated by the parties—and when effected, have been deemed almost miraculous—and retailed by Baptists as a wonderful intervention of heaven, which has rendered their font a second Bethesda. When we talk of the results of an operation, they are such, as from past experience, we are led to anticipate in future. These, as our recitals show, are adverse, to the scheme of our opponents, and prove that it was unlikely to have been instituted by Jesus Christ.

Our opponents cannot justly complain of our adopting this kind of argument against them, they led the way, they rendered this line of reasoning unavoidable, and, of course, should honourably bear with it. And yet the inconsistencies of some people are egregious. A person debating on the subject adduced the case of a woman, who, he said, had been materially benefitted by immersion, as an argument that Christ very probably instituted such a mode. However, when this was rebutted by a narrative of accidents and deaths, this same person was almost in a blaze, denouncing the declaration as a most unjust and iniquitous method of reasoning on the subject. Indeed, throughout the whole of

this investigation our train of argumentation has been invariably directed by the method pursued on the opposite side.

Should it be objected that the instances of accident adduced are from Pedobaptists and ought to be received with suspicion, we reply that Baptists were not likely to send the preacher narratives of events which operate so powerfully against their own avowed principles. It is, however, no uncommon thing to find open-minded Baptists sometimes conceding the existence of such cases as are now enumerated. Their writings broadly insinuate the same evils, and their precautions and contrivances place their opinions on this point beyond controversy. We have, however, the best authority available—ministers of religion, whose characters and office stand as pledges of their veracity. One instance we have noticed, was published by a minister on whose mind the circumstance narrated made such a powerful impression as to lead him to review the controversy and relinquish connexion with the Baptist denomination. Nor should it be forgotten, that the cures and benefits said to arise from immersion, and which our opponents would have us believe to be valid evidence in favour of their scheme, are related by themselves and not by us. Consequently they cannot reasonably object to the source of our evidence while they wish us to believe their own.

Upon the whole we may fairly come to this conclusion, that the institution of a rite which endangers the lives of believers, was not likely to have been appointed by Christ, to be of universal and perpetual obligation—that he did not enjoin such a ceremony, we conceive we have, from a diligent consideration of the holy oracles, fully established. The mode observed in the apostolic age was not dipping, plunging, or applying the person to the element—but pour-

ing, sprinkling, or applying the element to the person—and the mode to be scriptural and valid, must be performed in this manner in the present day, unless our opponents can show substantial reasons for its alteration.

CONCLUSION.

In bringing these discourses to a close, we beg to make a few concise observations.

I. We shall offer a few remarks respecting the manner in which we have conducted this investigation.

1. We have been as concise as the nature of the subject would fairly admit—perhaps have, in some parts, injured the strength of our positions by a too great condensation of the arguments. With all this brevity, however, we are not aware of having omitted a single point of importance on either side of the question. Whatever our opponents have said, in favour of immersion, has been clearly stated, and few answers, adduced by Pedobaptists, in support of pouring or sprinkling, have been overlooked. We have presented you with a tolerably correct epitome of the debate on the Mode of Baptism.

11. Though many things have been advanced that may be considered offensive by our opponents, we can assure them that nothing has been said which we do not consider fair and valid argument and relative to the subject. On the other side, all is brought forward, which immediately or remotely makes for their doctrine; and surely offence cannot be taken, if we conscientiously do the same. We should have acted unfaithfully in this dispute, if a single argument

we have adduced had been kept out of sight. At all events, those who treat the affusion of infants with so much contempt, and oft times with asperity—who ridicule our practice as childish and unmeaning—will have no reason, consistent with their own conduct, to condemn any kind of treatment from Pedobaptists.

III. We can most sincerely aver, that, in arguing this point, we are actuated by no disposition unfriendly toward the Baptists. We do regard them with unfeigned affection as the children of God; and if any expression has been dropped, which might indicate a different feeling, we are sorry for it; and hope our regrets will be construed into an ample apology. We debate with their principles, and seek only to correct an error, which, we imagine, they have fallen into. For this, we rather merit their thanks than deserve their censure. We have been candid and fearless in our statements and deductions—openly avowed our intention—and assidiously laboured to carry it into effect. We despise any thing like manœuvring in matters involving our religious pinciples.

IV. In the diversified methods of contemplating and arguing the numerous topics which have come under our notice, not a species of debate has been adopted, for which our opponents have not afforded us ample precedents. Whether we have had recourse to history—classics—deduction—concession—Greek—Hebrew—Latin—or English—fathers—utility—inutility—or the like—we have either shown you, or might have shown you, from the principal authors on the other side, that such weapons are used by themselves, or that the character of their reasonings obliged us to employ them.

V. We have been careful to avoid mis-stating the practice

and sentiments of the Baptists, or to take any unfair advantage of their remarks. As our dispute is not with any one individual but with the system of our brethren, as pourtrayed in their writings, we have not been led into any thing like personalities; nor have we thought it worth our while to pay any regard to many things which too often fill the pages of polemical treatises. Our object has been to seize upon our opponents' arguments and objections, and to examine them to the best of our ability—to show what was not relative to the subject, and what was invalid. It is well known that, in most controversies, much is frequently introduced having nothing in reality to do with the question at issue—of which Dr. Cox has given us a curious example, in devoting two-and-twenty octavo pages in combatting an etymological conjecture of Mr. Ewing, on which he professedly lays not the smallest weight in the course of his philological arguments.[1]

VI. With respect to the plan of the work, and the style we have adopted, we would merely say, that they were the best we could devise and the simplest we could employ. We are aware that two or three sections in the latter part might have been placed in the former—and that many things said in the first might as well have been deferred till the second. But to divide the work as near as might be into equal heads, and to render the arguments increasingly interesting, we deemed our present arrangement the best. Repetitions will have been observed, but they were unavoidable; and the composition was intended to convey arguments, rather than display itself.

II. We shall briefly recapitulate the arguments adduced in these discourses to establish our position. These may be

[1] Cox, p. 13-34; Ewing, p. 30.

classed under two heads—first, such as overturn the exclusive system of our opponents—and, secondly, such as maintain our own.

I. With regard to the former, we have endeavoured to show you that all our antagonists have said respecting the natural conclusions of common readers—the concessions of numerous Pedobaptists—the history and practice of the Christian church—the meaning of the Greek word baptize—the import of certain Greek prepositions—the circumstances of the first baptisms—and certain allusions to this scripture rite—by no means prove their point. We have also shown that all the parade about scripture precept and apostolical example, amounts to nothing like tangible evidence. We have proved likewise that their writers are at issue among themselves on every material principle of this enquiry; and that, from the various difficulties and dangers attending their mode, we have, *a priori*, evidence that immersion-baptism is unscriptural and improper. Whether the force of the reasonings has satisfied all your minds, it is not for us to determine—to ourselves, it is entirely conclusive.

II. In establishing our own position, that pouring, sprinkling, or applying the element to the subject, is exclusively Christian baptism, we have shown—that this action is in accordance with the frequent use of the verb baptize—that the mode of ministerial baptism among the Jews, was only sprinkling or pouring—that the instances of the New Testament baptisms, in which the mode of administration is at all intimated, support the idea of pouring or aspersion—that the vast multitudes baptized by John, and by our Lord's disciples, on the day of Pentecost and subsequently, must have received the rite in this manner. The mode of baptism by the Holy Ghost was always by coming to or upon the

persons baptized. We have, as said before, adduced the dangers and difficulties of immersion as auxiliary evidence in defence of our sentiment. Our assumption was, that the original mode of baptism could not be discovered by the import of isolated terms, but by the circumstances of its administration. These we have extensively investigated, and shown from evidence, anterior and collateral, that dipping one another was never practised, and that pouring or sprinkling was the only mode observed formerly and is the only one valid now.

III. Deductions from the whole discourse :—

1. We come now to the conclusion that immersing, dipping, or plunging one another is not baptism at all—and that those who have not received this sacrament by pouring or aspersion are yet unbaptized. That our opponents may not regard this inference as uncharitable, however they may deem it unscriptural, we have only to observe that this is precisely their assumption with respect to Pedobaptists. A few citations will prove this declaration.—*Mr. Booth* says, 'it appears to us, on the most deliberate enquiry, that im-'mersion is not a mere circumstance or mode of baptism, 'but essential to the ordinance—so that, in our judgment, 'he who is not immersed is not baptized.'[1] — *Dr. Ryland* says, 'Christian baptism is neither more nor less than an 'immersion of the whole body in water.'[2] — *Dr. Gale* says, 'Tertullian's maxim will hold true: They who are 'not duly baptized are certainly not baptized at all.'[3] — Again, 'I think it is clear that nothing can be Christian 'baptism which varies from Christ's institution.'[4] —*Mr. Dore* says, 'baptism is properly administered by immersion and

[1] Apology Misc. W. p. 349. [2] C. S. p. 5. [3] Gale, p. 66.
[4] Ib. 67.

'only by immersion.'[1]—'If,' says *Dr. Jenkins*, 'the words 'of the apostle (Eph. iv. 5) are to be regarded, there can 'be but one baptism, as but one faith. So that dipping or 'sprinkling must be the true. Both cannot be true.'[2]—*Mr. J. Stennett* contends, that 'baptism ought not to be 'administered more than once.'[3] After these assertions they may controvert our arguments, but must not question our charity. Now as we have proved that one person dipping another is not baptism, and that this rite was always performed by pouring or sprinkling, we must come to the conclusion that the Baptists are all wrong, in fact, are unbaptized; and ought, without delay, in order to fulfil all righteousness, to receive this sacrament by affusion or aspersion—and that whoever is induced by persuasion to be immersed, will submit to a rite that has no foundation in scripture, but is the mere invention of men, and 'a part of 'will worship.'

11. In closing these remarks, we beg to remind you that if it be of importance that water baptism should be scripturally administered, and that to comply with the injunctions of scripture is a duty we owe to God, of how much greater importance is it that we should be baptized or imbued with the Holy Ghost; without whose gracious influence all forms and ceremonies, however scriptural and proper, will avail us nothing in the day of judgment. Unless the Spirit be poured out upon us, and our hearts are regenerated by his energy, and our lives made conformable to his blessed will—unless we have sincere and saving faith in Christ, and holiness flowing from it, all our rites and sacraments will do us no real good. Let us never so occupy our thoughts and

[1] Intr. p. 13. [2] C. R. p. 12. See also Maclean, v. 1, p. 111.
[3] P. 37. See Gibbs, 126.

hearts about external ceremonies as to overlook or slight the internal operations of divine grace Let us never give a secondary consideration to the renewal of our natures and moral sanctity of our conduct. While we contend for the faith once delivered to the saints in the exhibition of signs and symbols, let us never forget that 'the thing signified, in-'ward and spiritual grace,' must be the chief matter of investigation and the supreme object of our research and prayers—may we be right in both—and, above all things, may 'our consciences be sprinkled from all dead works to 'serve the living and true God.'—AMEN.

THE END.

WINCHESTER:
ROBBINS AND WHEELER, PRINTERS.

Published by the same Author,

AND SOLD BY MESSRS. HOLDSWORTH AND BALL,

18, St. PAUL's CHURCH-YARD, LONDON;

LECTURES
ON THE CHRISTIAN SABBATH.

SEVENTH EDITION, ENLARGED, PRICE 3*s.* 6*d.*

This work (of which about Nine Thousand Copies have been already circulated) is printed in a cheap form, and sold at half the original price, in order to promote a still more extensive circulation.

This volume is considered a suitable present for young persons.

Extracts from the Reviews.

'The pious and intelligent author of the work before us, has brought into a small compass what we take to be, in the main, a very accurate, as well as a very comprehensive, view of the whole subject of the sabbath. There is scarcely any question of doctrinal interest, or of practical importance, connected with this great topic, which he has omitted. We cordially recommend the volume to the purchase and perusal of all classes of our readers. Theological students may profitably refer to it as a text-book, in which the argument of more elaborate treatises is condensed and methodized; while at the same time it is so intermixed with pious exhortation, and occasionally enlivened by appropriate anecdote, as to be excellently adapted for popular use.'—*Methodist Mag.*

'There is scarcely a mode of violating the sabbath, a motive for keeping it, or a benefit to be derived from it, which has escaped the preacher's notice. In many parts, there is a degree of originality, which we should not have expected to find on a topic which, in a certain view, may be considered as trite. The anecdotes introduced are quite *a propos*, and some of them are new to us, and highly interesting. We can, therefore, conscientiously recommend the work.' —*Evangelical Mag.*

'For the appearance of this work, the discreet and pious author deserves well of the whole Christian community. The originality of thought, the judicious arrangement of the subject, the terseness and ease of the style, the highly appropriate and commendable selections from other authors, the apt illustrations, the numerous references, the clear and comprehensive reasoning, the sound judgment every where displayed, stamp a character and value upon this work, and prove it to be worthy of a very extensive circulation.'—*Tent Meth. Mag.*

'For popular use, the work before us is excellently adapted. The industrious research which the author has made, the ardent piety and Christian simplicity which he displays, and the interesting manner in which he brings his various topics to bear upon the great point under consideration, entitle him to our cordial thanks, and well deserve our recommendation of his work to the religious public.'—*Eclectic Review.*

Extracts from the Reviews.

'He has produced an exceedingly interesting volume, rich in evangelical sentiment; and by his numerous and appropriate extracts from many of our best writers in prose and verse, he has rendered it uncommonly instructive and entertaining. We venture to pledge ourselves that it is a book in itself worthy of the notice of our readers.'—*New Evangelical Mag.*

'To illustrate all the variety of abuses, and profanations of the sacred day, we must refer our readers to the above works, and especially to the more ample details of Mr. Thorn, in his excellent and popular 'Lectures;' who has brought together a very great number of cogent arguments, important facts, interesting anecdotes, and persuasive illustrations on the Christian Sabbath. For aught we know, every thing that refers either politically or religiously to this important subject, Mr. Thorn seems to have brought forward with great care and suitableness. The pious Christian, the student, and the minister, will do well to avail themselves of the Lectures of Mr. Thorn.'—*Evangelical Register.*

'Most cordially do we recommend this comparatively small, but truly comprehensive work to our readers. Published at the low price of 3s. 6d. it is within the reach of a very large number of professing Christians, and we sincerely trust that they will avail themselves of its important lessons. Mr. Thorn has taken an extensive view of his subject, touched upon every point deserving of notice, and urged the due observance of the sabbath, both on professor and profane, with ingenuity, cogency, and affection. We hope that it will pass through many editions, and find a place in the library of every Christian family. The younger members of our families should have an opportunity of reading it, particularly those who are indifferent to the claims of the sabbath.'—*World Newspaper.*

Recommendations of the Work.

'*Having taken into serious consideration the great and growing profanation of the Lord's day in this kingdom; the numerous evils necessarily attendant on such notorious breaches of the laws of God and man; the beneficial results of duly regarding this hallowed institution; and the incumbent duty of every Christian to promote its proper observance; as also the utility of* Mr. Thorn's '*Lectures on the Christian Sabbath;*' *the purity of the style in which they are written; the comprehensive view of the subject which the author has taken; the correct delineation of character which he exhibits; the entire freedom of the work from all sectarian sentiments; and its perfect adaption to every class of the community: We, the undersigned ministers, do most cordially and unreservedly recommend the above-named publication.*'

Jabez Bunting, A.M.	William Jay	Joseph Sutcliffe, A.M.
John Clayton, Jun.	Joseph Ivimy	William Thorp
W. B. Collyer, D.D. &c.	William Manuel, D.D.	Ralph Wardlaw, D.D.
Francis A. Cox, LL.D.	William Newman, D.D.	Richard Watson
George Collison	Robert Newton	Alex. Waugh, D.D.
John Foster	T. Raffles, LL.D.	Matthew Wilks
Robert Hall	John Rippon, D.D.	Robert Winter, D.D.
William Harris, LL.D.	John Ryland, D.D.	James Wood
Thomas Jackson	J. Pye Smith, D.D.	

ANTIQUARIAN, TOPOGRAPHICAL,

AND OTHER WORKS,

PUBLISHED BY

ROBBINS AND WHEELER,

BOOKSELLERS TO WINCHESTER COLLEGE.

I.

In 2 vols. 4to. with numerous Engravings, Price Three Guineas,

THE

HISTORY, CIVIL AND ECCLESIASTICAL, AND SURVEY

OF THE

ANTIQUITIES OF WINCHESTER,

BY THE REV. JOHN MILNER, D.D. F.S.A.

A very few Copies remain of this learned and very popular work, the graphical illustrations of which bid fair to become, in a very short time, the only memorial of the numerous and venerable relics which formerly dignified and enriched the City of Winchester.

II.

In royal 8vo. handsomely printed, with several aquatinta Illustrations, very beautifully executed,

Ball's Walks through Winchester;

An entertaining and well-written History, and a convenient substitute for the larger and more comprehensive Work of Dr. Milner.

III.

In Six 4to. Parts, each containing THREE ENGRAVINGS, by *John Le Keux*, with Descriptive Letter-press, by the *Rev. Peter Hall, M.A.*

Picturesque Memorials of Winchester;

A Series of Original Views of the most interesting Buildings in that City and Neighbourhood; dedicated, by permission, to the Right Rev. the Warden, and the Rev. the Fellows, of Winchester College. Demy 4to. Parts, 2s. 6d. each; India Proofs, 5s.; India Proofs, large paper, 7s. 6d. each.

This beautiful work is just completed, and is recommended with confidence to every lover of the arts, the Sketches being taken with exquisite taste, and engraved in Le Keux's best style.

IV.

HARMONIA WYKEHAMICA;

THE ORIGINAL MUSIC USED AT WINCHESTER COLLEGE AND NEW COLLEGE, OXFORD,

Printed under the direction of the late Venerable Archdeacon Heathcote, Fellow of Winchester College, Price 8s.

V.

THE

WINCHESTER SPELLING-BOOK

And Complete English Reader,

WITH NUMEROUS ENGRAVINGS;

A New Edition of the Universal Spelling Book, improved and enlarged.

'So many improvements have taken place in the system of early education, since Fenning published his *Universal Spelling-Book*, nearly a century ago, that even the best modern editions of his work are considered cumbersome and defective. Still, the machinery of his system being practically true, and philosophically good, no discredit will attach to the present improved edition, from the circumstance of its containing the good and unexceptionable portions of that old and once-popular compilation.

'In modernizing and correcting the impressive stories of Fenning, selections have been introduced from the *Psalms* and other portions of *Holy Writ*, together with a series of *Lessons in Natural History*, from works of scientific authority, illustrated by admirable engravings in wood and metal.

'An ample collection of *Spelling Lessons*, properly accentuated, and divided into easy portions, suited to the capacities of children, has been substituted for the former meagre dictionary of words; whilst a selection of pleasing *Poetry*, equally calculated to interest the minds and to strengthen the memory of learners, has been introduced, with a compendium of *Reading Lessons*, more advanced in matter and style, to obviate the necessity of a detached Reader or Class Book. Correct Arithmetical Tables are also inserted, after the plan of the most approved Spelling-Books.

'With these are combined a short view of *English Grammar*, and an accurate analysis of *Geography*, collated with the best modern authorities, and as no education can be permanently useful and effective, the basis of which is not laid in piety, the Editor has annexed that admirable summary of Christian faith and practice, the *Catechism of the Church of England*, with the excellent elementary *Catechism of Dr. Watts*, and a few appropriate *Prayers*.

'Such are the varied contents of the *Winchester Spelling-Book*; combining, in a small volume, and at an easy expense, a Text-book of Information, beyond which multitudes who learn to read, have neither the time nor the opportunity of advancing. The boldness of the type, the beauty of the engravings, and the pains bestowed on the literary arrangement of the work, cannot fail, it is presumed, of recommending it to the increased patronage of those who are entrusted with the elementary education either of children or adults.'

VI.

THE JUNIOR CLASS BOOK;

SECOND EDITION, 12mo. Price 2s. 6d.

This elementary work was first printed for use in the author's school; and though never advertized, is rapidly becoming one of the most popular, as it is beyond doubt one of the most useful, publications that has ever been devised for the improvement of young persons.

U. C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES
C042802167